

A Student Anti-War Quarterly

anvil

And Student Partisan

PRO AND CON ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Irving Howe:

Southern Myth and William Faulkner

Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?

Sartre, the Devil and God Almighty

Conformity, Inequality and Fraternity

The Feinberg Law — A Bitter Defeat

Resistance to the Garrison State



S u m m e r 1 9 5 2

anvil

a student anti-war quarterly
and student partisan

Vol. IV - No. 2



Summer Quarter 1952

CONTENTS

Editorial: The Feinberg Law -- A Bitter Defeat	3
Editorial: Resistance to the Garrison State	5
Editorial: ANVIL Support Continues to Grow	5
Spotlighting the National Campus	6
Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?	10
Dr. Eddy Asirvatham	
Southern Myth and William Faulkner	13
Irving Howe	
Conformity, Inequality and Fraternity	16
Alan Daniels	
Sartre, the Devil and God Almighty	19
Stanley Plastrik	
American Foreign Policy: Two Views	25
Gabriel Gersh and Julius Jacobson	
Film Review: The Red Badge of Courage	31
Ernest Callenbach	

EDITORIAL BOARD

Julius Jacobson, <i>Editor</i>	Bob Bone, <i>Man. Editor</i>	Sam Bottone
Abe Victor	Irving Stern	Margaret Levi
Robert Mussigman	Joan Reynolds	Scott Arden
John Thompson	Pincus Gross	Bogdan Denitch
John Holmes		Charles Doehrer
Al Davidson, <i>Business Manager</i>		
David Senes, <i>Ass't Business Manager</i>		

ANVIL AND STUDENT PARTISAN editorials reflect the views of the majority of its editors. However, no single publishing club necessarily endorses all of the views expressed in the editorials. The magazine is published by the following student organizations:

NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR
247 Lexington Avenue New York, N. Y.

SOCIALIST CLUB OF ROOSEVELT COLLEGE
POLITICS CLUB OF UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
FOCAL POINT OF YALE UNIVERSITY
SOCIALIST STUDY CLUB (UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS)
THE NEW PERSPECTIVES OF ANTIOCH COLLEGE

MANAGER'S MEMO

Dear Friend,

The achievement of Anvil and Student Partisan in becoming the largest selling serious student magazine is due to the attractiveness of its message, its contents and, to a large extent, to your loyal and devoted support. In addition to reading and distributing the magazine, however, there is something else you can do to help us increase our financial stability.

The business office is launching a special campaign to obtain advertisements for the next issue. If we are to have ads in our Fall issue we simply have to do the leg work now. The Spring semester is also "short selling season" and in order to equal the income received in the Fall the difference must be made up in paid ads.

Who should be approached for an ad?

1. Your local bookstore, stationer, luncheonette etc. Usually these enterprises have a fund set aside for this purpose and it helps to get there first.

2. Campus clubs and off-campus organizations can be contracted even if they don't agree with everything in Anvil's program.

3. Individuals should be persuaded to give at least a booster ad for 50 cents.

Below is an ad blank for advertisers to fill out. Please collect at least 50% of the ad cost now.

Fraternally,

Al Davidson, Bus. Mgr.

CONTRACT

The undersigned hereby contracts for page advertisement to appear in the Fall issue of ANVIL & STUDENT PARTISAN at \$.....

Name of Advertiser

Street

City

Paid

Balance

Signed

Solicitor

Please attach copy on separate sheet

Full Page \$50.00

Half Page \$25.00

Quarter Page \$12.50

Eighth Page \$ 6.25

Booster ad \$.50

Editorials:

The Feinberg Law -- A Bitter Defeat

EARLY IN MARCH, the Nine Old Men sat in judgment on the future of academic freedom in the State of New York. They concluded their deliberations by upholding, 6-3, the constitutionality of the notorious Feinberg Act. Abandoning the principle of freedom of inquiry in the public schools, the Truman-appointed majority of the Court valiantly resolved, in its own words, "to protect the schools from pollution." Justice Douglas, in a resounding dissent, charged that "What happens under this law is typical of what happens in a police state."

The Feinberg Act is technically intended to implement legislation already on the books of New York State. By a law of 1917, "treasonable or seditious utterances or acts" barred employment in the public schools. By the Civil Service Law of 1939, public employment was denied to those who advocate overthrow of the Government "by force, violence, or any unlawful means." *No proceedings have ever been taken under these laws.* The motivation of the New York State Legislature in passing the Feinberg Act is significant in this context.

The preamble of the Feinberg Act presents a "legislative finding" to the effect that members of subversive groups, especially the Communist Party, have been infiltrating the public schools, in spite of the existing legislation. Furthermore, members of these groups have been using their position to propagate subversive ideas. This propaganda, however, "is sufficiently subtle to escape detection in the classroom." It therefore becomes necessary to enact restrictive legislation based on a teacher's activities and associations *outside* the classroom, regardless of considerations of competence, or of actual conduct in the school. The case of the New York State Legislature, in short, rests explicitly on the principle of guilt-by-association, and its point of view has now been given official sanction by the highest court in the land.

In its instructions to the Board of Regents, the Feinberg Act initiates three procedures not embodied in previous law. (1) It sets up a reporting system, requiring the Regents to report annually to the Legislature on the state of loyalty in the schools. (2) It instructs the Regents to draw up a State "subversive list" for the purposes of the Act. In so doing, the Regents "may utilize any similar listings . . . authorized by Federal law, regulation, or executive order." (Not mentioning any names.) (3) Finally it declares that membership in any organization so listed is *prima facie* evidence for denial of employment.

One further point should be made. The preamble of the Feinberg Act, as well as the majority opinion of the Supreme Court, imply that the Act is solely concerned with protecting the "immature minds" of small children. If this were so, it would be bad enough. The fact is that the jurisdiction of the Act extends to the *college level*. Section 12A of the Civil Service Law, which the Feinberg Act implements, reads in part: "nor shall any persons be employed . . . as superintendents, principals, or teachers in a public school or academy or in a state normal school or college. . ." The minds of students in the New York City colleges are no doubt regarded by the sponsors of the law as particularly tender and unformed.

"No Constitutional Infirmity"

Since its enactment in 1949, the Feinberg Act has had a checkered career in the courts. It was first declared unconstitutional by the New York Supreme Court, but this decision was later reversed by the New York Court of Appeals. When it finally reached the Supreme Court, the law was attacked on two grounds: (1) that it violated the First Amendment, by abridging the teacher's right to freedom of speech and assembly. The appellants argued that the teacher, like other citizens, has the right to join political organizations of his own choosing, without being penalized for the *organized* expression of his political convictions. (2) that it violated the Fifth Amendment, because the making of mere membership in an organization an automatic ground for dismissal deprived the teacher of "due process."

The majority opinion on these two points of law was delivered by Justice Minton. He found no limitation on the teacher's freedom of speech or assembly: "His freedom of choice between membership in the [subversive] organization and employment in the school system might be limited, but not his freedom of speech or assembly. . . . He is at liberty to retain his beliefs and associations and go elsewhere." (The learned Justice might have added that he is particularly at liberty to go straight to jail under the Smith Act.) Nor could Justice Minton find any denial of due process in the provisions of the law for guilt-by-association. "One's associates, past and present . . . may properly be considered in determining fitness and loyalty. From time immemorial, [a weighty precedent — B.B.] one's reputation has been determined in part by the company he keeps." Justice Minton also found a guarantee of due process in the

hearing provided for an accused teacher, — an argument which the Douglas dissent demolishes.

In his dissent, Justice Douglas initially addresses himself to the points of law at issue. He first challenges the power of a state government to place its employees in the category of second-class citizens: "The Constitution guarantees freedom of thought and expression to everyone in our society, and none needs it more than the teacher." Then, attacking guilt-by-association as "a principal repugnant to our society," he points out the fraudulent nature of the "hearing" provided in the act: "In that hearing, the finding as to the 'subversive' character of the organization apparently may not be reopened in order to allow [the teacher] to show the truth of the matter." The irrebuttable charge that the organization is "subversive" becomes even more of a weapon for the state when it is recalled that the state "subversive" list is to be modeled, in all likelihood, on the US Attorney-general's list, which was compiled without the slightest recourse or appeal by the organizations listed.

The Real Issue

So much for the Constitutional question. Justice Douglas by no means limits himself to this sphere, but attacks the law as a thought-control measure, spelling out the effect of regular loyalty reports on the teacher's classroom performance: "The law inevitably turns the school system into a spying project. . . The principals become detectives, the students, the parents, the community becomes informers. . . The prejudices of the community come into play . . . [as it seeks] for hidden meanings in a teacher's utterances." The very threat of such a procedure plays havoc with academic freedom: "Fearing condemnation, [the teacher] will tend to shrink from any association that stirs controversy. . . A problem can no longer be pursued with impunity to its edges. . . Discussion often leaves off where it should begin. . . A 'party line' lays hold. . . It is the 'party line' of the orthodox view, of the conventional thought, of the accepted approach."

It is just such a narrow orthodoxy which motivates the sinister theory of public-school education elaborated by Justice Minton: "A teacher works in a sensitive area in a schoolroom. There he shapes the attitude of young minds toward the society in which they live. In this, the State has a vital concern. . . It must maintain the integrity of the schools as a part of ordered society." The function of the schools, in plain language, is to buttress the status quo, by indoctrinating young minds with the proper attitudes toward established social institutions. In such a school system, not merely Stalinist opinion, but *all* opinion critical of the present order of things must be proscribed. And this, to be sure, is what the Feinberg Act is all about. Its real purpose is to terrorize teachers into ideological conformity. It employs fear as a weapon against free thought, because it was itself conceived in fear — in that hysterical panic which is associated historically with dying civilizations.

Relation of School State

It is that same panic which accounts for the revolutionary departure from the traditional American attitude

toward school and State, contained in the majority opinion of the Court. When a democratic society is secure, it adopts a laissez-faire attitude toward the schools. It encourages varied intellectual views, in the belief that the best will prevail. Justice Black expresses this laissez-faire view at its best, in his dissent on the Feinberg Act: "Basically this law rests on the belief that Government should supervise the flow of ideas into the minds of men. Quite a different governmental policy rests on the belief that Government should leave the mind and spirit of man absolutely free."

When on the other hand a society is threatened with annihilation; when the world-system of which it is a part is shaken to its foundations; when small men become panic-stricken; — then a certain rigidity appears in the society, and the State tightens its grip on the educational system. Then, in the words of Justice Minton, "the State may exercise its police power to protect the schools from pollution, and thereby defend its own existence."

Then, instead of pursuing the truth to its edges, *though the State be found in error*, the schools become the supine servant of the State. When bold thinking is most required, only stifling orthodoxy is permitted. The functional *separation* of school and State is abandoned. Instead of maintaining intellectual independence, in order best to preform its unique function, the school system becomes integrated into the State apparatus. The Nazis had a word for this process: *Gleichschaltung* — a procedure by which all important social institutions were absorbed into the total State and utilized for its ends.

The Feinberg Act is one more instance of the abandonment of the best traditions of the American republic, and of the institutional shift toward a garrison state. West Point is the prototype of the educational institution required by the garrison state. It is characterized by rote learning, a student spy system, almost no study of the humanities, and complete regimentation of student life. The Feinberg Act inaugurates a major departure from our free public school system in this direction.

BOB BONE

Bob Bone is managing editor of *Anvil and Student Partisan*.

Interest and Membership

If you are interested in joining or receiving more information about the *New York Student Federation Against War*, fill out the blank below accordingly and mail to the Federation at 247 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

I Want to Join

I Want More Information

Name

Address

School

Resistance to the Garrison State

UNIVERSAL MILITARY training has been shelved for this session of Congress. The Truman administration's drive for a permanent conscription law to succeed Selective Service was halted by a House vote of 236 to 162, which sent the bill back to committee for "further study." This vote followed a complicated series of parliamentary maneuvers, and climaxed a bitter six-hour battle in which it appeared that UMT proponents might succeed in carrying a watered-down version of the bill. An analysis of the final vote reveals political trends of interest to those who oppose the evolution of American society into some form of garrison state.

Because of traditional American resistance to any proposal for permanent militarization, UMT is an especially sensitive political barometer. The reception accorded to UMT by Congress is a good indication of how far the winds of public opinion have veered from traditional republican forms in the direction of a garrison state. It seems reasonable, therefore, to read between the lines of the vote on UMT, and to examine various political tendencies for their deeper attitudes toward the garrison state.

Political Motivations Behind Vote

Three facts stand out in the vote: most Republicans opposed UMT; a good many Dixiecrats opposed it; and most liberals supported it. The Republicans voted five to one to kill UMT. The clue to Republican opposition can be found in the remarks of Representative Shafer of Michigan, inserted in the Congressional Record:

There has been repeated and unmistakable evidence that the schemes of the "social planners" are completely tied in with UMT, and that UMT is only the vestibule, the front hallway, leading into their larger plans for regimentation.

As for House Democrats, 131 voted with the Truman administration, while only 81 voted to kill UMT. But of these latter, 47 were Southerners. The Mississippi delegation in particular, led by John Rankin, was vocal in its opposition to the bill. The reason why this staunch upholder of white supremacy opposes UMT is no secret. He finds the sight of Negroes in military uniform offensive. He does not trust the military to maintain watertight segregation between white and colored troops. He is afraid that a few months' experience beyond the borders of God's own country might make returning Negro soldiers "uppity." Military effectiveness — not white supremacy — is the supreme value in the garrison state.

In contrast to the Dixiecrats, Congressional liberals overwhelmingly supported the administration forces. Of a list of twenty Congressmen, selected by an ADA member as the creme-de-la-creme of the 82nd Congress, — the twenty who nearly always vote "right," — only 5 voted to shelve UMT, while 15 voted with the administration! (With liberals, it's the garrison state, three to one.)

It is not that the liberal temporarily accepts the dangers of UMT (like the Korean War) as a "calculated risk." This argument can be used to defend selective service, but

not *permanent peacetime* conscription. It is rather that the liberal's sensibilities have become so dulled where the State is concerned that he does not even recognize UMT as a threat to democracy. He cannot achieve any perspective on the Leviathan he has helped to create. President Roosevelt, let us remember first asked for permanent peacetime conscription in his "State of the Union" address in January 1945, during the period of "Big Three Unity." Henceforth, in fair years or foul, in the halcyon days of the United Nations, or under the blackest shadows of the Korean war, Roosevelt's successor has persistently followed his example. UMT, and the Fair Deal's "permanent war prosperity," fit hand-in-glove.

The Congressional line-up on UMT confronts us with a paradox. Republicans and Dixiecrats — each for their own reasons — have balked at taking a major step toward the garrison state. Yet this opposition to UMT represents in part a loyalty to traditional values no longer relevant from Washington's point of view in a world permanently at war. Paradoxically, it is the old-line conservative (literally) who opposes the emergence of a garrison state, while the more flexible liberal is willing to experiment with political forms that he finds more suitable to the atomic age.

In tracing these political undercurrents, we should not lose perspective of what actually took place on Capitol Hill. There is a more obvious level of pressure-group politics through which these underlying forces assert themselves. On this level, the Truman administration, the Pentagon, and the American Legion battled it out with labor, farm, religious, and educational groups, — *and lost*. It was a victory for democracy, and especially for American youth.

BOB BONE

ANVIL Support Continues to Grow

THE EDITORS OF *Anvil and Student Partisan* welcome the endorsement of our magazine made by the Young People's Socialist League at its recent national convention. In addition to endorsing the magazine, the youth section of the Socialist Party adopted a vigorous third camp, anti-war position. The YPSL support of the magazine will go a long way in broadening the base of the magazine and in winning further support for our efforts to re-create a powerful student anti-war movement. Since its convention, members of the YPSL on campus have been selling *Anvil and Student Partisan*, are urging clubs in which they participate to sponsor the magazine and are attempting to organize a number of new anti-war student clubs.

In addition to YPSL endorsement, we are proud to announce the formation of a new broad, anti-war club at Antioch College, in Ohio, called *The News Perspectives*, which voted in favor of sponsoring *Anvil and Student Partisan*.

Spotlighting the National Campus Scene

Utah Students Defend Academic Freedom

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF University Students for Academic Freedom is a very young organization, in the first stage of its development. It was founded by students at the University of Utah in January of this year as an answer to the recent growth of coercive practices against political dissenters — practices which have unhappily cast a shadow of fear over many college campuses in the United States. The founders believe that the association can provide valuable assistance to students and educators who are anxious to defend their academic liberties and their intellectual honesty against the rising tide of intimidation.

The portentous development of this basically un-American trend was previously indicated by the famous series of articles in the *New York Times* last May. Since then there have been several unrelated cases which appear to raise the issue of academic freedom. Among the more widely publicized are the case of a philosophy instructor at the University of Minnesota who seems to have been fired for his socialist leanings, and the restraints which have been imposed upon the highly regarded daily newspaper at the University of California as the result of two articles which were objectionable to the Board of Regents. These are representative of the coercive tactics which threaten to become the order of the day. They do not evidence an appreciation for freedom of thought in education, but spring from an attribution of evil to people with unpopular ideas. If this attitude persists unchallenged, academic integrity will be replaced by fear and suspicion.

Realizing this, the students of America must stand together in the first line of defense against political attacks on education. Undoubtedly they have the most to lose if our institutions of learning stifle under a blanket of enforced orthodoxy. Evidently they are not exposed to the same economic pressures which are frequently used to whip faculty members into line. The fact that most colleges are financially dependent upon their students while most students are financially independent of their colleges identifies the student as the most strategically situated guardian of academic freedom.

On January 13th of this year, Justice William O. Douglas threw down the gauntlet to American students. In an article in the *New York Times*, he accused the present generation of "holding its tongue," and of abandoning its traditional role of revolt against orthodoxy. A few days later, a group of students at the University of Utah responded to his challenge, by launching the American Association of University Students for Academic Freedom, described by its founders in the accompanying article.

Two aspects of the new organization are worthy of comment: first, its spontaneous character. It has been initiated not from a traditional center of student militancy, but on a campus which, up to now, has been relatively inconspicuous in national student affairs. This augurs well for the broadest possible student support of the movement.

Secondly, the Utah students rest their defense of academic freedom on the firmest possible basis, from a student point of view. They appeal to American student not simply to defend this or that professor's right to teach, but in so doing, to defend the student's own right "to explore unorthodox ideas and express divergent opinions." Take away this right, and the student is literally deprived of a liberal education. Nothing less is at stake. With such a strong appeal to fundamental student values, the AAUSAF should experience rapid growth.

Anvil welcomes the advent of this new organization, in a crucial area of student concern. We urge our sponsoring groups to participate in the AAUSAF's "committees of correspondence," and our readers to cooperate to the utmost with its activities on behalf of academic freedom.

THE EDITORS

However, attempted violations of student and faculty rights tend to be successful because the offenders invariably enjoy an overwhelming preponderance of power over isolated victims. Although every violation has grave implications for the country at large, the responsible authority is usually secure in his own locality. It follows that the most effective way to resist isolated violations of academic freedom is through the effective coordination of national student support. This is the theory which produced the AAUSAF. It explains the function that the AAUSAF is prepared to assume, namely the distribution of academic freedom information by means of a newsletter to affiliates throughout the country. The *Academic Freedom Newsletter* will carry first hand information concerning alleged violations so that, when an incident occurs, students everywhere will know about it, will be able to correspond with one another, consider the facts and take joint action as may be necessary to meet the situation. It may be expected that the prospective glare of national student opinion will cause potential offenders to think twice before embarking upon a course of action which involves the abridgment of academic freedom.

Since the time the original correspondence was sent to students at more than seven hundred colleges, the association has received a good deal of encouragement and student support. While the central office is set up to function in the capacity of an information service for its affiliates, local chapters of AAUSAF are presently being formed at many colleges. All such local units will naturally operate with complete autonomy.

Additional printed information and membership forms may be obtained by writing to:

American Association of University Students for Academic Freedom

1140 Kensington Avenue
Salt Lake City 5, Utah

JOHN H. NAISBITT
(President of the student body, University of Utah)

RICHARD L. SKLAT
Editor of College Forum,
weekly journal of student opinion.)

Witch-Hunt Hysteria Hits Wayne University

As Students Rally to Defend Rights

AN INTENDED COUP de grace was dealt the tortured residue of student rights at Wayne University when the House Un-American Activities Committee conducted its investigations in Detroit last February and March. This latest blow at Wayne's academic freedom, which was one of the most alarming consequences of the Detroit witch hunt, took the form of an arbitrary and unprecedented suspension of a student by Wayne president, Dr. David D. Henry. The student, Mrs. Lorraine Faxon Meisner, who was subpoenaed to testify before the committee because she allegedly attended the East Berlin Youth Rally, in the pattern of most other witnesses refused to answer many questions. Like other witnesses, she invoked the fifth amendment as the constitutional basis for her refusal. The Detroit press made special note of the fact that she giggled throughout her testimony. In a telegram sent after her appearance before the committee Dr. Henry announced her suspension, stating that her behavior was inconsistent with her obligations as a student and was "either unreasonable or prima facie evidence of criminal action." Two weeks later the Council of Deans upheld the president's move by expelling Mrs. Meisner.

As the most recent and most audacious violation of student rights at Wayne, this suspension of a student because of her political convictions was the culmination of a series of efforts to stifle freedom at the university. The administration's motivation in this instance was the same as in previous violations i.e., the appeasement of the state legislature from which Wayne seeks appropriations for new buildings. The first action of this kind occurred in 1947 when an AYD chapter was banned from Wayne's campus. Shortly after, all political and social action groups were tabooed. In 1950, Dr. Herbert Phillips, an avowed Communist and former professor at Washington University, dismissed because of his political opinions, was invited by the Student Council to debate a Wayne professor. Although Phillip's appearance on campus had been approved by the University Programs Planning Committee, an elected body of students and faculty members, a last-minute edict by President Henry prevented the debate from materializing. A few months later, Farrell Dobbs of the Socialist Workers Party was refused the use of university facilities after he had been invited to speak by a group of students.

Student Body Brought Back to Life

After each of the earlier violations since the banning of AYD there had been some opposition on the part of students to the autocratic policy of the administration. But it was not until the Meisner issue that a sufficient number

of students were roused from their apathy to make a resounding and meaningful roar of protest.

The protest acquired organization after a large initial group of liberals and socialists met off-campus and formed the Committee for Student Rights. At first there was indecision among the liberals concerning the question of Stalinist participation. Some thought it was undemocratic or irrelevant to exclude any political tendency. Gradually, however, enough members became aware of the need for clearly differentiating the group from the Stalinists for the committee to pass a resolution to that effect. The action by the committee was in vivid contrast to the handling of the Phillips case when a few Stalinists had captured the protest group, assuring its failure.

It was recognized from the beginning by most committee members that the suspended student would probably not be re-instated. However, it was also realized that unless a protest was made, there would be no limit to the gradual but persistent destruction of student rights.

After formulating its statement of purpose the committee proceeded to ask for statements from faculty members and well-known liberals throughout the nation. Telegrams were sent to Albert Einstein, John Dewey and others. The Student Council and the Detroit Federation of Teachers joined in the condemnation of the suspension. Flyers were distributed and petitions circulated.

A large street corner meeting held by the Stalinists and featuring two men who had testified before the Un-American Activities Committee, served only to create hostility among many students who failed to make a distinction between principled opposition to the suspension and the hypocritical indignation of the Stalinists.

Although the intentions of the Committee for Student Rights were good, its effectiveness suffered from organizational ineptness and a hesitancy which contrasted with the bold determination of the Administration. Having learned from its mistakes, the committee as a recognized campus organization, is now prepared to swing into militant and rapid action if and when a future violation occurs.

Despite the success of the administration in sustaining the suspension, this struggle for student rights at Wayne has significance since it should tend to prevent the recurrence of such outrages. It also has importance as still another reminder that students are unwilling to stand by while their rights are usurped one by one amidst the hysteria of a growing garrison state.

DON O'FARRELL

Don O'Farrell is a student at Wayne University.

Workers in Strike at Columbia Must Have Student Support

FOR THE PAST FEW weeks a "labor situation" has hit a New York campus, an Ivy League school, at that. The food and maintenance workers at Columbia University, organized by the Transport Workers Union have gone on strike for higher wages. The pay of these workers has averaged no more than \$40 per week. But the Columbia University administration evidently feels that any increase over this munificent sum would have a demoralizing effect on the institution as a whole.

The administration is giving the student body a lesson in scabbing and strikebreaking that can vie with the best courses it offers in Labor-Management Relations. A propaganda barrage has been unleashed against the strikers by the administration, and it has been discovered that unionism and education are not compatible institutions. The administration has gone to the extreme of hiring some miserable student scabs and paying them more than the prevailing wage rates!

We are certain that the majority of Columbia students sympathize with the strikers, despite the odious action of Student Council in condemning the attempt to unionize the workers. But mere sympathy is not enough. The students must be more vocal and organizationally active in their support of the underpaid cafeteria and maintenance workers. The Columbia *Spectator* has already shown the way with its pro-union editorials. The paper and the student body should follow through. It is okay to beat Harvard, to slaughter Princeton, to run through Yale, but there can be no honor in whipping the union.

JULIUS JACOBSON

News from the West Coast

UCLA Lifts *Anvil* Ban

In December, 1951, Dean Hahn at the University of California at Los Angeles placed a ban on the proposed sale of *Anvil* in the student bookstore. The ban followed two months negotiations on the part of the UCLA cell of the Fellowship of Reconciliation to get *Anvil* in the bookstore. The FOR group then took its fight to the campus

as a whole and to Student Council, which set up a committee to study the matter. In the midst of the growing fight, in which one student had pledged to test the ban by selling *Anvil* on campus and being expelled for doing so in order to get a court case, the administration reversed itself and lifted the ban.

UCLA Forms Civil Liberties Committee

A numbers of student organizations have formed an all-campus "Civil Liberties Committee" to work for the rights of political and religious groups to be decognized on campus. At the first meeting, a small Stalinist group attempted to gain a dominant role, but the liberals and radicals touned out in large numbers at the second meeting and carried all the seats on the steering committee. The first project of the group is to get a Student Commission set up to investiage alleged violations of student rights. The Berkeley campus, under the leadership of the SDA, is also forming such a group. The ACLU has expressed an interest in a possible court test of Regulation 17 which prohibits political and religious groups on either of the two state university campuses.

California Issues Student Paper

The Southwest Youth Section of the FOR is issuing a regular mimeographed paper — FOR-CAST — which will be sent to any interested student in the U.S. If you would like to learn more about the pacifist position and radical activities in Southern California, write to: FOR-CAST, 132½ Ashland Ave., Ocean Park, Calif.

Censorship at Iowa

EARLY THIS WINTER, a typical Greek-letter incident occurred at the State University of Iowa. Phi Gamma Nu, a sorority for professional women, refused to pledge a Negro girl. This refusal was admittedly based on racial prejudice, since the girls voted specifically to uphold an old policy of discrimination. After the vote, the president of the sorority resigned in protest; several "pledges" declined to join the organization; and one girl wrote a letter of protest to the campus paper, the *Daily Iowan*.

The *Iowan* promptly pigeon-holed the letter, refusing not once, but twice to carry it. The second refusal followed a visit made to the *Iowan* offices by a group of students who requested publication and queried the editor on his reasons for suppressing the news. The editor excused himself in terms of avoiding "irresponsible journalism," claiming that more time was needed to check the facts. He also expressed a fear of causing trouble, citing the Cicero riots in support of his fears.

The students responded by printing a handbill at their own expense, attacking the twin evils of racial disscrimination and censorship. Before permission for distributing the handbill could be obtained, the Associated Press got the

What do you think of ANVIL?

Your letters of criticism or support are welcome. They will help us to publish a more effective magazine.

Please note whether part or all of your letters may be published in *Anvil*.

story about the sorority, and it was broadcast over the Cedar Rapids station. The next day, the story was carried by the newspapers, including the *Daily Iowan*, which also ran a reproduction of the handbill. The *Iowan* had suddenly discovered "new facts in the case"; they denied that the appearance of the story on their own AP wire had forced their hand. Simultaneously, President Hancher issued a statement to the press describing the university as "a salient in the battle lines against racial discrimination," but defending the right of groups and individuals to associate freely, — thus exhibiting the main talent required of a successful college president.

Students Unite Against Discrimination

The next line of action was to call a joint meeting of various student organizations, which was attended by unofficial representatives from the Young Republicans, Young Democrats, Young Progressives, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Committee on Racial Equality of the YMCA, United World Federalists, Student Christian Council, Peace Group of the YMCA, Town Men, and Applications Committee. At this meeting, several people verified the facts of the case, and evidence was presented which indicated that faculty pressure was largely responsible for the suppression of the story. In fact, this pressure had caused a shake-up on the *Iowan* staff some weeks earlier. The meeting voted to bring the matter up at the next official meeting of Student Council. Some of the individual organizations adopted resolutions, most of them weakly chiding the *Iowan* and the sorority. The NAACP was the most vigorous, calling for a university ban on all campus organizations that discriminate on racial grounds.

In mid-December the Student Council met, and after listening to arguments on both sides, defeated a motion to censure the *Iowan*. A second motion then carried which "cleared" the paper of the charge of censorship, but found it guilty of "some negligence." After a suggestion by a member of the journalism faculty that matters of alleged censorship should be presented to the Publications Committee (a student-faculty board), three students appeared before that committee to give their views. They were allowed to testify (each one separately, while the others waited outside), then were politely thanked, and just as politely ignored.

The whole episode at least resulted in rousing some students from their usual apathy. It provided a good outlet for the pent-up resentment of some foreign students, including Africans, against patterns of segregation all over America, and the official sanctions they receive. Furthermore, the issue provided a rallying point for students ranging from mildly liberal to radical, and a significant unity of action was achieved. Possibly this will set a precedent for more effective action in the future.

BARBARA GIBSON

Barbara Gibson is a student at the State University of Iowa.

Students Win Rights at Chicago

LATEST EVENT on the civil-liberties scene here was Student Government's creation of a "Campus Newspaper Advisory Commission" to over-see the *Chicago Maroon*, about which controversy has been raging since fall, when Dean of Students Robert M. Strozier dismissed Stalinist editor Alan Kimmel (allegedly for attending the Berlin Peace Congress, though other reasons were substituted later) and simultaneously suspended the *Maroon* from publication. (The ban was lifted after a week.)

An investigating committee of Student Government, after much deliberation, presented a compromise report recommending a strictly advisory board with no power to remove the editor or otherwise control the paper, but with what amount to inspection powers. It will receive and investigate complaints of violation of the *Maroon* constitution (the clauses on free entry to the staff and no removal without due cause) and may print its findings on such cases, together with general journalistic criticisms, at reasonable length in the *Maroon* itself. However, Student Government removed from the commission its proposed powers as a referring board or "lower court" — it can no longer pass directly on to the Student-Faculty-Administration Court its findings on a case; though it may presumably give informal assistance to individuals with legitimate grievances. Incidentally, no case of grievance (on the open-entry and no-removal clauses) was discovered through the hearings on the situation.

When the investigation began, a sizeable bloc of opinion in Independent Student League, the liberal-coalition majority party (see *Anvil*, Winter, 1951) favored a quite stringent control board, but later hesitated on the dangers of this and finally supported the merely advisory board. The staff of the *Maroon* for the most part opposed any board; the new (non-Stalinist) editor Martin Orans argued to the investigators that any board would constitute an opening for suppressive forces to use in the future, when a new round of rightward moves by the administration may develop.

The *Maroon* action follows the success of the Student Government stand on an earlier question — recognition of the Labor Youth League. The administration held up recognition of L.Y.L. on the ground that it might be "illegal". After much pressure on the Student Government, and much behind-the-scenes finagling on both sides, Dean Strozier allowed S.G.'s recognition to stand. (The Dean holds veto power over recognition of student groups.)

On these two major issues of the year, thus, liberal elements in the student body have held the line with fair solidity against administration encroachments. Barring a serious increase of pressure from "the outside," or a collapse of morale in the liberal student groups active in campus politics, this year may prove to have been a turning point. A group including several members of the Politics Club who sit in S.G. is currently trying to draw campus attention to the need for continuity in policy on the part of the Independent Student League and other political organizations if the line is to be held during the summer and on into next year.

Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?

An Indian Leader's Challenge to the Western World

NO ONE IS EXPECTED to give an assured answer to this sixty-four dollar question. How Asia will meet Communism does not depend on it alone. It depends upon a variety of factors, over some of which at least Asia has no direct control at present. It depends in particular on the policies adopted by Western powers towards Asia. If they continue their present forms of imperialism — no doubt milder than the earlier — and treat the Asian people as mere pawns in a game of power politics, Asia will have no reason to join one side or the other.

Asia at present is far more interested in economic justice and racial equality than in taking sides in the power struggle. Russia is succeeding in convincing many Asians that it alone among the great powers of the world stands for racial equality and economic justice. However, even the illiterate masses of Asia are slowly coming to realize that Communism has no respect for individuals, and that it treats the individual merely as a cog in the wheel. But the Asian is caught on the horns of a dilemma — coercive Communism on the one side and coercive imperialism on the other, with neither of which he is in sympathy. He finds that no sooner were Japanese militarism and totalitarianism put down by the joint efforts of the East and West, than the imperial powers, with substantial American assistance, returned to Indonesia, Indo-China, and Malaya to continue their exploitation and oppression.

As for their racial practices, the Western democracies, more than any other powers, have made Asia color-conscious and race-conscious. When early European settlers landed in India and China they were treated as welcome visitors. But in the course of time they lost this confidence because of their color-complex. Not having learnt a lesson from earlier follies, Western powers are now assiduously propagating the myth that the present world struggle is an East-West struggle, insinuating thereby that all that is tricky and brutal comes from the East. The bulk of Soviet Russia may be in the continent of Asia, but her philosophy, social institutions, and statecraft are predominantly Western. Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Marx, who are the philosophical progenitors of the Russian state system, were not Orientals. To many in Asia, the present power struggle is not an East-West struggle, but a West-West struggle into which Asians are drawn, often against their own wishes.

It is an irony of our day that without a shooting war, Communism has spread its tentacles over a considerable part of the world. While before World War II, only about 200 million people lived under the Communist regime, the number today is 800 million. The most significant gains have been made in Asian lands. To assume that this phenomenal spread is due to the cleverness and strategy of

Stalin and his *politburo* is to give them far more credit than is due.

Many in the Orient are giving heed to the seductive appeal of Communism for a variety of reasons. No part of the world has such abject poverty and oppressive landlordism as does Asia. An overwhelming majority of the people are underfed, poorly clothed, and ill-housed. Illiteracy reigns supreme in many parts of Asia. To people living under these conditions, freedom and democracy mean little unless they are translated into concrete economic terms.

Asia's Economic Needs

The Government of India today has laudable schemes for the improvement of the economic conditions of the masses. There is a five-year plan and there are several river valley projects comparable to the T.V.A. But for the most part they remain only on paper. Year follows year and plan follows plan: but hunger, starvation, and unemployment stalk the land. Nehru himself is a man of courage and vision. But he does not have the necessary number of able and selfless lieutenants to carry through a bold, new program. He is excellent in his analysis of the present situation in India and the world at large. But when it comes to action he seems paralysed. The forces of reaction are too strong.

What does all this mean for the West? To tell the starving Asian that living conditions are infinitely better in the U.S.A. than in Soviet Russia, and that individual freedom is more respected in the former country than in the latter, is a mockery. The Asian knows that he cannot have the American economic "paradise" in his life time. But he is willing to listen to the Communist, so long as he promises to abolish landlordism and money-lending at exorbitant rates of interest, and give him better living conditions, even if that means going through a blood-bath which he foolishly hopes will be only for a little while. The young intellectual in Asia is attracted by such Communist slogans as "planned production for community consumption" and earnestly believes that Communism provides him a channel for human idealism which he claims modern democracy has failed to do. He tends to regard democracy as mercenary and corrupt, where material gains not infrequently are the monopoly of the crafty and the well-organized pressure groups in society.

Without even shooting a gun, Communism will continue to make inroads in Asia, if the *bourgeois* parties in the Western countries do not wake up in time and speedily set their houses in order. One reason why North Korea was able to win the affection of the people in the early stages of the struggle at least is that while the American occupation authorities and the South Korean government were

dilly-dallying with the question of land distribution, the North Korean government promptly proceeded to attack it as its No. 1 problem. It is likewise naive to assume that Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists lost out because they did not receive adequate military support from the United States. The fact of the matter is that the core of the regime became rotten, and nothing on earth could have saved the outer covering.

Challenge to the West

Can the West redeem its mistakes of the past? The present policy of the Western powers to cover the entire face of the world with military alliances and bases is short-sighted and suicidal. Even a man like Dulles realizes that 25,000 miles of Maginot line cannot assure peace and security. When the testing time comes, it is bound to crumble. Communism cannot be stopped by guns. It can only be stopped by concerted and immediate steps being taken to improve the living conditions of the masses. The fundamental conflict in Asia today is not a conflict between rival ideologies. It is a conflict between persons or systems that offer one meal a day and those that offer a meal and a half a day.

It is a truism to say that if you want to stop Communism, you must stop poverty. The problem may appear stupendous, but it is worth trying to solve. It is better to fail in an endeavor which will ultimately succeed than to succeed in an endeavor such as militarism which will ultimately fail. The first requisite of world peace, and the primary way of stopping Communism, is a world-wide economic and social program, to the successful prosecution of which every country, friend and foe, will be invited to make its generous contribution. As the Woffords assert in *India Afire*, Point IV must become Point I of American and world policy. These should be hundreds of Horace Holmeses with a missionary zeal and passion, giving themselves to meeting the basic needs of the common man.

If Asia is to turn its back upon Communism and give its loyal and whole-hearted support to the Western world, it is a folly to tie military provisions to any economic aid. Economic aid given under a Mutual Security Act may sound altogether reasonable to Americans; but Asians do not view it in the same light. Already the governments of Burma and Iran and the Moslem party of Indonesia have raised their voice of dissent to any form of Mutual Security Aid. Negotiations have been completed for a grant of fifty million dollars to India under this act. But it is not made clear whether any military involvements are implied. If America insists on military alliances, the granting of bases, and the sale of strategic materials as conditions of economic aid, the characteristic Asian answer will be "You keep your money and we keep our self-respect." Asian countries which have only recently acquired their political freedom after years of struggle are not too keen to place their necks under any form of imperialism, however gentlemanly it may appear.

In the contest with Communism, Asia cannot be expected to get red hot in its feelings, so long as the Western powers perpetrate imperialism in Indo-China and Malaya, hold on to such possessions as Hongkong, Pondicherry, and

Goa, place a stigma upon the limited number of Asians who may desire to settle in Australia and New Zealand, or practice racialism of the worst kind, as in South Africa. The cry of the democratic countries is further bound to fall on deaf Asian ears so long as arms and ammunitions are poured into the laps of Chiang Kai-shek in preparing him to invade the mainland of China when the suitable time comes. Many in India who cannot be accused of being pro-Communist believe that China has greater claim to Formosa than the U.S.A. has to Hawaii. It is also their belief that the current American policy in relation to China is one of aiding and abetting a civil war and closing one's eyes to realities. Many in India who believe in the wonderful capacity of the Chinese people for adaptation hold that if China were not pushed around as much as it is today, it might eventually evolve an economy and philosophy of its own which would be part-time capitalist and democratic, and part-time Communist and totalitarian, but all the time Chinese, even as in its religious loyalty China is part-time Confucian, part-time Buddhist, and part-time Taoist.

In Event of Invasion

The question in which most Americans are interested is, will Asia, with American military assistance, be prepared to take up arms against a possible Communist invasion? Here again, there is no one answer. Different Asian countries may adopt different policies. The present ruling classes in such countries as the Philippines and Siam primarily in their own self-interest, may readily take up arms. Many in India and Burma are likely to say that modern warfare is a luxury which they cannot afford. They will argue that World War II pushed them off their slender economic margin from which they have not yet recovered, and that World War III will push them into an abyss from which they cannot hope to rise during the lifetime of any one living. They may even say that when two big giants like Russia and the U.S.A. come to blows with each other, it is wise for little fellows like themselves to keep out.

If India is directly invaded by the Communists, Nehru is bound to use his armed forces. He may even make a frantic appeal to the United Nations. But the best course in keeping with the demonstrated efficacy of the non-violent program and policy of Mahatma Gandhi will be to practice *Satyagraha* or soul force, using such weapons as non-cooperation, civil disobedience, and refusal to pay taxes, without ever entertaining any kind of bitterness towards the invader and oppressor. The Indian has a mystic faith that when the testing time comes God will raise a person such as Vinoba Bhave to lead the non-violent struggle. India, being at least half-pacifist, first thinks of negotiation, mediation, conciliation and non-violence as instruments befitting human dignity, and only secondarily thinks of armed intervention.

Because of long years of racialism which the West has practiced against the East, the Orientals, in spite of their national differences and jealousies, have a certain amount of fellow-feeling towards each other. This being so, Chinese aggression is likely to be less resented than Russian aggression. The Oriental may have a blind faith that it

will be easier for him to work out a compromise with a fellow-Oriental than with an Occidental. This fact partly explains the rejoicing of many an Asian person when Japan invaded South-east Asia and drove away the European before him. If Japan had not become as grasping and aggressive and brutal as it turned out to be, it would have enjoyed the affection and gratitude of Asians for a long time.

A further fact to note in forecasting the reaction of Asia to Communist invasion is the half-fatalistic outlook of many Asians. They can be roused to action when they can be given a dynamic faith in a cause as was done under Gandhi. But very few of them will be prepared to throw away their lives in order to make the world safe for British and French imperialists, American militarists, South-African race-baiters or Australian advocates of a 'white Australia policy.' If told that the alternative of Russian and Chinese totalitarianism is bound to be infinitely worse, the immediate reaction of the Asian is to shrug his shoulders and say that it is a Hobson's choice so far as he is concerned.

Imperialism Must Go

Asians at present are generally lukewarm towards the West in its frantic efforts in building a dyke against the Communist tide. One chief reason for it is the systematic way in which even today the West ignores Asian people and their trusted leaders in planning for the future of Asia. It is like a person building a beautiful nest of his own in which a passing bird may lay its eggs and hatch the young ones for him to play with. If the West is not careful, the West may build the nest, but the East will refuse to lay the eggs.

What consultation there is should be effective, taking into account the psychology of the people and their fears and suspicions as well as their felt needs. Rightly or wrongly, much of the East believes in a considerable amount of state action and a middle economy. Increasing numbers in India believe in a decentralized Gandhian socialism.

The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00

Cloth-bound \$2.00

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th Street

New York 11, N. Y.

Therefore, to preach to them the virtues of a Simon-pure capitalism is a waste of breath. Asians must be given a full opportunity to work out their own salvation. They resent being considered the wards of anybody. When Mr. Warren Austin exclaims "We will not abandon Asia to tyranny," the Asian asks, "When did he become my godfather?"

If Asia in general and India in particular, which is a middle or third power in Asia, are to be understood aright, it is well for Americans to realize that we are 100% opposed to imperialism, whatever the brand may be, and that we are at least half-spiritual, half-pacifist, half-socialist, and half-fatalist.

Charles Malik of Lebanon is completely right when he says: "Communism cannot be met by a mere *nay*; it requires a mighty *yea*." The "mighty *yea*" calls for the surrender of every vestige of imperialism and colonial exploitation and of racialism and racial inequality, the respect of people as people, disinterested economic and technical assistance on a scale undreamt of hitherto, and the fast replacing of war, violence, and strife by non-violence, love, and peace with freedom and justice.

DR. EDDY ASIRVATHAM

Dr. Eddy Asirvatham was, until recently, head of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at the University of Madras, and is now Professor of Mission and Christian International Relations at Boston University.

If you. . . .

Oppose the imperialist maneuvers of both the American and Russian war blocs. . . .

Want to do something about building a democratic socialist movement in America. . . .

Believe in the rights of students to organize on campus according to their political beliefs. . . .

then, your place is with the SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

Youth Section of the Independent
Socialist League

For more information about the Socialist Youth League and for sample copies of *The New Internationalist* and *Labor Action*, America's leading socialist publications fill out the blank below and mail to:

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 West 14th Street

New York 11, N. Y.

Name

Address

School

Southern Myth and William Faulkner

Effects of Tradition on Faulkner's Artistic Development

UNTIL VERY RECENTLY, regional consciousness has remained stronger in the South than in any other part of the United States. This "historical lag" is the source of whatever is most distinctive in Southern thought and feeling. After its defeat in the Civil War, the South could not participate fully and freely in the "normal" development of American society — that is, industrialism and large-scale capitalism arrived there later and with far less force than in the North or West. By the Reconstruction period New England regional consciousness was in decline and by the turn of the century the same was probably true for the Midwest; but the South, because it was a pariah region or because its recalcitrance in defeat forced the rest of the nation to treat it as such, felt its sectional identity most acutely during the very decades when the United States was becoming a self-conscious nation. While the other regions meekly submitted to dissolution, the South worked desperately to keep itself intact. Through an exercise of the will, it insisted that the regional memory be the main shaper of its life.

Perhaps because it had so little else to give its people, the South nurtured in them a generous and often obsessive sense of the past. The rest of the country might be committed to commercial expansion or addicted to the notion of progressive optimism, but the South, even if it cared to, was unable to accept these dominant American values; it had been left behind, it was living on the margin of history — a position that often provides the sharpest perspective on history. During the decades that followed the defeat of the South, its writers could maintain a relation to American life comparable, in miniature, to the relation in the nineteenth century between Russian writers and European life. For while nineteenth-century Russia was the most backward country on the continent, its writers managed to use that backwardness as a vantage-point from which to observe west-European life and thereby to arrive at a profound and withering criticism of bourgeois morality. Precisely because Russia was trailing the capitalist West, the Russian writers could examine the bourgeois code without hesitation or illusion. It was this crucial advantage of distance, this perspective from the social rear, that was the major dispensation the South could offer its writers.

And it gave them something else: a compact and inescapable subject. The Southern writer did not have to cast about for his materials, he hardly enjoyed a spontaneous choice in his use of them, for they welled within him like a dream recurrent since childhood. Faulkner has given a

vivid if somewhat romantic description of this subject in *Intruder in the Dust*:

... For every Southern boy fourteen years old, not once but whenever he wants it, there is the instance when it's still not two o'clock on that July afternoon in 1863, the brigades are in position behind the rail fence, the guns are laid and ready in the woods and the furled flags are already loosened to break out and Pickett himself with his long oiled ringlets and his hat in one hand probably and his sword in the other looking up the hill waiting for Longstreet to give the word and it's all in the balance, it hasn't happened yet, it hasn't even begun. . .

But of course it has happened, it must begin. The basic Southern subject is the defeat of the homeland, though its presentation can vary from the magnolia romancing of *The White Rose of Memphis* to the despairing estimate of social loss in *The Sound and the Fury*. Nor does it matter, for the moment, whether one defines the Southern subject, in Allen Tate's words, as "the destruction by war and the later degradation by carpetbaggers and scalawags, and a consequent lack of moral force and imagination in the cynical materialism of the New South," or as the defeat of a reactionary slaveowning class followed by its partial recapture of power through humiliating alliances with Northern capital and a new scrofulous commercial class of local origin. Regardless of which interpretation one accepts, the important point is that this subject, like a thick cloud of memory, has been insistently and implacably there. The Southern writer could romanticize it, reject it, enlarge it into an image of the general human situation; he could not escape it. And precisely this ubiquity of subject matter provided him with some very considerable advantages. Not so long before the Civil War, Hawthorne had remarked that "No author can conceive of the difficulty of writing a romance about a country where there is no shadow, no antiquity, no picturesque and gloomy wrong, not anything but a commonplace prosperity." But now the War and Reconstruction gave the Southern writers all that Hawthorne had found lacking: all but antiquity. And there were ruins to take the place of that.

It was not until the First World War, however, that serious Southern writing began to appear — that is, not until Southern regional consciousness began to decay. One reason for this lag was simply that before the 1910's and 1920's there had not been enough money in the South to send many young people to college or to encourage them in such social luxuries as literary careers. A land bent by defeat was not likely to turn to letters with an urgent passion or enthusiasm. Nor could the South look back upon

a serious literary tradition of its own, certainly none comparable to that of New England; ante-bellum Southern writing had for the most part been sentimental, genteel, and insipid. Its talented men had given themselves to politics and oratory, and had looked upon literature as a minor pastime hardly sufficient to engage their intellectual capacities. Only some decades later, when the most sensitive minds of the South would be appalled by the Snopesian vulgarity of its politics, would they turn to the arts half in hope, half in desperation.

For it was the reality of twentieth-century life, in all its coarse provocation, which drove so many Southern writers to a regional past that in happier circumstances they might have peaceably neglected. The mottoes of Southern agrarianism were hardly to be taken seriously as social proposals for the most industrialized country in the world, but as signs of a fundamental quarrel with modern life, an often brilliant criticism of urban anonymity, they deserved very much to be taken seriously.

Before the Southern writers could make imaginative statements about their own past, they had to be exposed to intellectual drafts from beyond their regional horizon. Southern literature at its best — the work of Faulkner, Caldwell, Ransom, Tate, Warren — was conceived in an explosive mixture of provincialism and cosmopolitanism, tradition and modernity. To measure the stature of their ancestor Poe, the Southern writers had first to understand what he had meant to Baudelaire, and for that they had to possess a sophisticated awareness of the European literary past. For the Southern imagination to burst into high flame it had to be stimulated, or irritated, by the pressures of European and Northern ideas and literary modes. Left to itself, a regional consciousness is not likely to result in anything but a tiresome romanticizing of the past and thereby a failure to understand the present. Once, however, the South reached that point where it still remained a distinct region but was already cracking under alien influences, it could begin to produce serious work of art. As Allen Tate has shrewdly remarked, the distinctive Southern "consciousness is quite temporary. It has made possible the curious burst of intelligence that we get at the crossing of the ways, not unlike, on an infinitesimal scale, the outburst of poetic genius at the end of the sixteenth century when commercial England had already begun to crush feudal England." What Tate seems to be saying here is that Southern literature assumed a dimension of seriousness and grandeur only when the South as a region began to die, when its writers were forced to look back upon a past that was irretrievable and forward to a future that seemed intolerable.

It is therefore insufficient to say, as many critics do, that Faulkner is a traditional moralist drawing his creative strength from the Southern myth; the truth is that he writes in opposition to his tradition as well as in acceptance, that he struggles with the Southern myth even as he acknowledges and celebrates it. His relation to his own beliefs is far more ambivalent and difficult than was the case for most nineteenth-century American writers. We may safely assume that Melville and Whitman, in their major work, were moved by the democratic yearnings of

nineteenth-century America; one feels of *Moby Dick* and *Leaves of Grass* that they are books written with the resources of an entire age behind them. Melville's epic conceptions and Whitman's rolling declamations follow, in part, from their adherence to a myth that is still viable and therefore likely to stir men to dedicated action. Faulkner, however, is working with the decayed fragments of a myth, the somewhat soured pieties of regional memory, and that is why his language is so often tortured, forced, and even incoherent. Unquestionably Faulkner has been influenced by Melville, but in their uses of language one can see reflected the difference between a belief still vigorous and a belief picking at its own bones. Yeats's definition of rhetoric as the will doing the work of the imagination is pertinent to both Melville and Faulkner, but particularly to Faulkner. For what is the soft shapeless rhetoric of *Sartoris* but the sign of a strained will floundering in sentimentality, and what is the agonized rhetoric of *Absalom, Absalom* but the sign of a strained will confronted with its own intolerably acute awareness?

What then is the Southern myth? Like any other myth, it is a story or cluster of stories that expresses the deepest attitudes and reflects the most fundamental experiences of a people. And its subject, in this case, is the fate of a ruined homeland. The homeland — so the story goes — had proudly insisted that it alone should determine its destiny; provoked into a war impossible to win, it had nevertheless fought to its last strength; and it had fought this war with a reckless gallantry and a superb heroism that, as Faulkner might say, made of its defeat not a shame but almost a vindication. But the homeland fell, and from this fall came misery and squalor: the ravaging by the conquerors, the loss of faith among the descendants of the defeated, and the rise of a new breed of faceless men who would fatten on their neighbors' humiliation.

From these stories there follows that pride in ancestral glory and that mourning over the decline of the homeland which comprise the psychology of the "lost cause." Thus, for one intermittently Southern writer, John Peale Bishop, the South found its highest distinction in "a manner of living somewhat more amiable than any other that has ever been known on the continent." And for another Southern writer, Allen Tate, the South is the one place that "clings blindly to forms of European feeling and conduct that were crushed by the French Revolution." Where else, he asks, "outside of the South, is there a society that believes even covertly in the Code of Honor?"

A myth which pervades a people's imagination is hardly open to rational attack or defense, particularly when it is considered as part of a work of literature. The historian, no doubt, would have to compare the claims of the Southern myth with the actual course of Southern history. He would evaluate the tradition and order so often ascribed to the old South; inquire exactly for whom its way of living could be somewhat more amiable; speculate on the extent to which the Southern emphasis on honor and heroism may often have been a means of salvaging pride from defeat or a token of uncertainty about the moral value of its cause. And if our historian were inclined to moral reflection he might ask the one question that by its very

nature the myth cannot tolerate: granted heroism, granted honor, was the homeland defending a just cause? For the critic these questions, while important, are not the crux of the matter, since it is hardly necessary to take a face value or even give substantial credence to the claims of the Southern myth — I certainly do not — in order to acknowledge the powerful uses to which it can be put by a sympathetic imagination. The Southern myth, like any other myth, is less attempt at historical description than a voicing of the collective imagination, perhaps of the collective will. The old South over which it chants in threnody is an ideal image — a buried city, Allen Tate has called it. Both the violence and the poignancy with which this ideal image has been employed suggest an awareness that the buried city can never be found.

Such myths form the raw material of literature. The writer often comes to a myth eager for acquiescence, but after articulating its assumptions he may begin to wonder about its meaning, its value. During the past few decades Northern writers have been engaged in a large-scale examination of the myths of industrial capitalism, of enterprise, accumulation, and success; the rejection of these

myths has motivated a great many contemporary writers. Somewhat similarly, Faulkner in his stories and novels has been conducting a long, sometimes painful and at other times heroic examination of the Southern myth. He has set his pride in the past against his despair over the present, and from this counterposition has come much of the tension in his work. He has investigated the myth itself; wondered about the relation between the Southern tradition he admires and that memory of Southern slavery to which he is compelled to return; tested not only the present by the past, but also the past by the myth and finally the myth by that morality which has slowly emerged from this entire process of exploration. This testing of the myth, though by no means the only important activity in Faulkner's work, is basic to the Yoknapatawpha novels and stories; and from it comes his growing vision as an artist.

IRVING HOWE

Irving Howe is a free lance writer and author of Sherwood Anderson and The UAW and Walter Reuther. The above article is a part of his book, William Faulkner, which will appear in July, 1952.

A MESSAGE TO READERS OF ANVIL

Eight months ago, without fanfare, a new publication was born.

It promised to print the many stories and articles that most newspapers and magazines **dare not publish** because they might bring forth pressure group reprisals or advertising cancellations.

In short, it promised to dig out and publish "inside stories" which would have no other possible way to reach the American people.

The name of the publication is **EXPOSE'**.

Said our statement of policy:

"... Expose' will do battle with frauds, whether they be people or products. Expose' will fight bigotry. It will spotlight all who would destroy our freedoms — whether they be Communists or the '1000% Americans' who would adopt Communist methods in their pretended fight against Communism.

Expose' is independent and liberal, as the great majority of the American people are independent and liberal.

Hundreds of exciting stories and articles have already appeared in Expose':

*The Prescription Racket by Edmond Dickson. . . *Religion and the Press. . . *The Truth About Winchell (the 80,000 copy seller that inspired the New York Post series). . . *Life Insurance, the most for your money by Sidney Margolius (former shopping editor of PM). . . *Anatomy of the Murder-Mystery by G. Legman. . . *extracts from Tom Paine and Robert G. Ingersoll. . . and — articles by noted attorney Arthur Garfield Hays, Billy Rose, Robert Ludlow (associate editor of *The Catholic Worker*), Rep. Adam Clayton Powell, and so forth.

We have published stories that newspapers wouldn't touch on the activities of CORE, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and other pro-American anti-war groups.

In the current issue (#6) we feature stories on the four Doty brothers who are in prison for their novel rejection of the draft. . . and of Ammon Hennacy who for nine years has refused to pay income tax because "most of the tax goes for the upkeep of war."

We are now working on a most unusual issue, one that will present all sides of **The Coming American Socialism** — presenting first-hand views by people on all sides of the question.

Expose' is a monthly — but hopes to publish twice a month when our subscriptions reach a break-even level.

Begin your subscription now by using the coupon below.

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

EXPOSE', Dept. A

56 West 55th Street, New York 19, N. Y.

I want to subscribe to Expose'. Please send me

() the next 21 issues for which I enclose \$3

() the next 11 issues for which I enclose \$2.

Name

Address

City..... Zone..... State.....

Conformity, Inequality and Fraternity

Habits and Curriculum of the Campus Fraternity

AT MOST AMERICAN universities, fraternities and sororities are living-groups. These living-groups have a number of things in common: their values, their internal structure, their effect upon members, and their function in the campus society. These things which most fraternities and sororities have in common make them a cohesive organism, a whole which is usually referred to as the "fraternity system."

In the course of the controversy occasioned by the "fraternity system" in recent years, it has been assumed both by its champions and adversaries that it fulfills a unique function on the campus. Few people, however, have been willing to analyze this function. The present article is not an attempt at long overdue scientific analysis, for such an analysis would require careful documentation from many campuses. The purpose of this article is rather to discuss certain traits which seem significant, and to indicate directions in which further study might be fruitful. Fraternities alone are mentioned, because the name is more commonly used to designate the whole — in most cases, what applies to fraternities is equally true of sororities.

A fraternity, it has been said, is above all a form of living. When asked about the purpose of such a group, most fraternity men will answer that it teaches people to get along together; that it teaches social manners and rules of good behavior; that it provides a congenial atmosphere for college students; that it teaches a desirable system of values: loyalty to the group, honesty, truthfulness, courage, etc.; consequently, that it prepares students to become successful members of society and good citizens.

Values of the "Brothers" and "Sisters"

Such are, more or less, the claims of *all* living groups on the campus; what makes them differ among one another is a difference in the interpretation of terms and a difference in emphasis. A clue to the interpretation of values in the fraternity system is its internal hierarchy, in which some fraternities are rated high on the scale, others low. For example, the Sigma Chi fraternity or Chi Omega sorority are rated as superior and socially desirable, whereas fraternities such as Tau Kappa Epsilon or Theta Chi are lost somewhere on the bottom of the list. The criterion on which such a rating system is built is based mainly on the fraternity's role in intramural sports, dating and participation in "activities," in decreasing order of importance. The fraternity must rank high in intramural contests; a sorority must be sought after for dates — often a situation develops in which fraternity men "date" the sorority rather than the individual girls — and it is good if the members of the fraternity participate in "activities" — usually musicals, yearbooks, humor magazines; activities,

that is, which demand little intellectual exertion, creativeness or sense of social responsibility. Very few engage in political activity — whether conservative, liberal or radical — in serious artistic or intellectual creation. In such a society built on a limited range of thought and activity, the interests of the members are obviously limited. The scope of the fraternity product is necessarily restricted to social activities, and this on a very impersonal, abstract level — one does not go out with Jean Smith, one "dates a Kappa." Most other activities are also subordinated to this criterion of social prestige: sex is competitive and impersonalized, one "makes" girls like one scores points in a contest, one collects "activities" not for their own sake but for the sake of accumulating them. As a result of this, the code of behavior is not so much based on the value of the action as such to the person but rather on the social prestige that may be derived from it.

Discriminatory Practices in Fraternities

The fraternity system maintains this pattern of values, interests and activities by an elaborate machinery of defense against outside influences on the one hand, and of enforcement of conformity on the other. Fraternities have become notorious by their discriminatory devices more than by anything else. To this date only very few accept Negro and Jewish members, and many have "quotas" for Catholics. In addition the "rushing" committees of the fraternity usually prefer "pledges" who do not differ too much from themselves, in terms of background, appearance or interests. This preliminary selection is buttressed later by a system of mystical initiation ceremonies and social pressures, an internal hierarchy and numerous regulations. It is well-known that if one wishes to join a fraternity one passes through the "pledge" stage, from which one emerges after a variable period of time — usually one semester — to the status of "active". During the pledge stage one has fewer rights and more duties than the active. It is a sort of trial period in which unreconstructed non-conformists can be weeded out and the other pledges cast into the mold of the respective fraternities. This is obtained by breaking as much as possible whatever individual characteristics there are that conflict with the pattern; the techniques are the time-honored ones of repression, and differ only in degree from those used in the Army. The significance of hazing, paddling, "hell-week", is the enforcement of conformity — if the pledge "can take it" he will make a good fraternity member. Today the trend is, however, towards replacing outright brutality with subtler forms of repression: pledges are made to perform menial work for the actives; or they are required to eat directly from the dish with the hands folded behind the back; or

to walk around the campus carrying signs; or to sing and dance before the group at meals; in short, any number of senseless and humiliating tasks which are designed to tear apart their personality before it is put together again to fit the prevailing pattern.

The Social Graces -- Frat Style

The result of this process is people that closely resemble each other in outward appearance, behavior, outlook, mental and emotional scope. To some degree these people are interchangeable, as proved by the dating system practiced between fraternities and sororities, especially by the custom of "blind dating" — obviously it matters not so much who the girl is one goes out with as long as she meets the accepted requirements of the system: pastel-colored angora sweater, woolen skirt, white socks, saddle shoes, breasts, member of a high-ranking sorority, the accepted set of facial expressions, epilated, deodorized, manicured, and without too much pretense at intelligence lest she scare her date.

It would appear, then, that "loyalty to the group" in the fraternity system means first and foremost "conformity to the group." As far as the goal of "learning to get along together" goes, it is undoubtedly fulfilled since it is easy for people to get along together when there is no noticeable difference between them. If, however, the term is to have any meaning, "getting along together" should be a desirable achievement for groups and individuals that are *different*. In this respect the fraternities fail. To begin with they restrict themselves by racial and religious discrimination to a selected group which in turn is "purged" from potential diversity and hence from disturbing influences. What remains is drawn from the Anglo-Saxon, protestant middle class of merchants, wealthy farmers, business executives, bureaucrats, and professional men described in *Middletown*, of which Ruth Benedict says:

Eccentricity is more feared than parasitism. Every sacrifice of time and tranquillity is made in order that no one in the family may have any taint of non-conformity attached to him. Children in school make their great tragedies out of not wearing a certain kind of stockings, not joining a certain dance class, not driving a certain car. The fear of being different is the dominating motivation recorded in *Middletown*.*

The consequence of this is not "getting along together" but, on the contrary, a great deal of mistrustful provincialism and of hostility against anything different. This hostility is usually stronger in the fraternities which are low on the social scale, and sometimes assumes extreme forms of snobbishness. The fraternities which are rated higher are, as a general rule, more secure and can afford more normal behavior.

Two Main Functions

From the fraternity point of view these considerations are irrelevant, however, since the traits described above contribute to the fulfillment of its two main functions, which are to create an artificial elite in a traditionaally

* Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, New American Library, p. 252.

democratic society, and to train the faceless, irresponsible class of obedient specialists which the managerial state demands. This latter function is well described by William H. Whyte Jr. in *Life* magazine of January 7th, 1952. In his article *The Wife Problem*, a discussion of the ideal wife for the up-and-coming business executive, he says:

(management) knows exactly what kind of wife it wants. With remarkable uniformity of phrasing, corporation officials all over the country sketch the ideal. In her simplest terms she is a wife who (1) is highly adaptable (2) is highly gregarious (3) realizes her husband belongs to the corporation.

Are the corporation specifications presumptuous? It would appear not. The fact is that this kind of wife is precisely what our schools and colleges — and U.S. society in general — seems to be giving the corporation. (my emphasis—A.D.)

In this context it is also significant that fraternity students have often been used by corporations or small business men to break up radical meetings, CORE actions or labor strikes — two instances are typical: the breaking of a CORE sit-down strike against a discriminatory restaurant by the football team at the University of Kansas in 1949, and the breaking of a telephone operators strike in Los Angeles by sorority girls who were employed by the company for the duration of the strike at half the wages normally paid to the striking operators. As a general rule, few of the participants in such actions understand what they are doing and no doubt conceive of themselves as standard bearers of the American Way of Life.

The Minority Group Fraternities

The fraternities are not alone on the campus. There are the university dormitories and the co-ops. There are also the minority group fraternities. The latter are a somewhat related phenomenon and deserve close attention. They are, in the main, the Negro and Jewish fraternities and sororities. These organizations are structurally quite similar to the ordinary fraternities, but have a few progressive traits — sometimes young "house-parents" instead of mothers, these institutionalizations of the "mom" complex; also, a greater amount of housework is done by the members themselves. Sometimes the spirit in these houses is also quite different, fresher, more alive.

The existence of these organizations, however, is in itself indicative of several important phenomena: one, that if fraternity life is to be considered statistically normal college life, minorities are forced to segregate themselves in order to participate in it; two, that these members of minority groups who organize themselves into their own fraternities, instead of participating, for instance, in interracial groups, are *ipso facto* accepting the segregation that has been imposed on them. Instead of creating their own values they are accepting those of their "upper class" in which they themselves are "inferior". In other words, they are entering the campus society on the terms of the fraternity caste, and to them the act of emancipation does not consist in creating their own pattern of life, in being themselves, but in imitating as closely as possible the example of the dominant caste. Needless to say, this is but another form of bondage.

The other living groups on the campus should be briefly compared to the fraternity system since they provide at the same time a scale of comparison and potential alternatives. Many universities have recently embarked on a building program for dormitories. These usually house groups of about 50 or 60 people, as much as a large fraternity, or even groups of several hundred. They usually also have housemothers and officers invested with a certain official authority. In most cases they don't discriminate on a racial or religious basis. Although they don't put the same emphasis on social values as the fraternities do, they maintain a paternalistic atmosphere in which the power to make the decisions that matter does not rest with the students, and in which the development of a real sense of responsibility is inhibited. Socially they accept for the most part the leadership of the fraternities. Much like the fraternity system, the university dormitories are built on authoritarian principles, on the assumption, that is, that the student does not know what's good for him and that all important decisions must be made by the father image, this being either the fraternity elite, or the deans, or both.

Principles of Student Co-op Movement

The co-ops encompass a relatively small percentage of the students, but deserve close attention inasmuch as they are the only type of student living group that is built on premises fundamentally different from those of the fraternity system. Their "ideological" basis are the so-called "Rochdale principles", of which there are six: (1) open membership, regardless of race, color, religion or creed; (2) one member, one vote; (3) cash payments from patrons; (4) limited return on capital; (5) savings returned to members; (6) extension of co-operative administration — expansion, that is. Insofar as a student co-op functions successfully, its spirit is usually very basically democratic, not to say libertarian. All authority that is respected rests with the group; all decisions of importance are taken by the group. There is a minimum of rules, bureaucracy, disciplinary or punitive devices; there is no discrimination except on the basis of anti-social behavior, if it threatens the existence of the group. When the university regulations demand houseparents, they are usually a young couple, not very much older than the membership of the house, who function inconspicuously in the house like the average member. It is easy to see that in such a set-up responsibility rests primarily with the individual, and that habits of independent thinking and democratic procedure are more likely to be established here than in the paternalistic or downright authoritarian atmosphere of the university dorms and fraternities. For this reason co-ops have traditionally served on the campus as basis for liberal and radical student activity, without ever committing themselves officially to liberal positions except in limited situations.

Weak Points in Co-op Movement

Unfortunately, the co-ops are not everywhere and always the democratic utopia that has been sketched above. In some universities they approach the ideal fairly closely, in some others they are stagnating, in others they are

disintegrating. This is not surprising: on the campus today freedom of thought and responsibility are a heavy load to bear. The university system as a whole is oriented in a contrary direction, and the reactionary trends in society at large are reflected on the campus. Their consequence, apathy and fear, have also affected the co-ops. For the co-ops to maintain themselves in such a situation will require considerably more militancy, vigilance and understanding of social events than that which has been shown by the co-op leadership so far. As the case may be, co-ops are today the only real challenge to the fraternity system, the only attempt by students to create a system of values based on equalitarian, libertarian and hence genuinely democratic values. The co-ops themselves are not always conscious of the wider implications of their basic premises — the fraternities are even less so, incidentally. Sometimes, however, they conceive of themselves as definitely fulfilling a social function which is in all points opposed to the social functions of the fraternity system. At the University of Kansas, for example, their propaganda booklet *What Are the K.U. Co-ops?* states:

On the K.U. campus you are likely to find out that the co-ops are just about the only student organization which accepts you as a responsible adult. Co-operative living requires and develops the maturity implied in the free acceptance of responsibilities, rather than obedience to orders, as an essential condition for a free society. And, of course, this is our social aim: trying to make our society more one of free and voluntary co-operation rather than one founded on conflict and compulsion. By their organization as student-owned, student-operated, student-governed living units, the co-ops are preparing today the foundations of a better, freer society.

Necessity for Long-Range View

The question remains of what to do about fraternities — besides building co-ops. This, in turn, raises the question of whether anything can be done. The fraternity member comes to college already seasoned by high-school fraternities which, if possible, are parodies of the college fraternities. Moreover, he usually comes from a thoroughly — if sometimes subtly — reactionary background. While in the fraternity he is immunized from outside influences by the multiple pressures a system can apply to wavering members. The social forces all around us are also unfavorable: many universities are becoming little more than trade-schools for docile technicians; the country is hysterical, non-conformists are hounded in college like everywhere else, the veterans have left the colleges and most juvenile regressions, lumped together by the generic name of "school spirit", have been revived. However, communication can almost always be established, if considered worthwhile, even if it is a slow and tedious process. If nothing else, we may remember that wherever there is repression there is rebellion, and that in every herd of sheep there are a few black ones.

ALAN DANIELS

Sartre, the Devil and God Almighty

An Analysis of the French Existentialist's Latest Work

THE FLIES, RED GLOVES, *The Respectful Prostitute* and now *The Devil and God Almighty*. These four plays form the cornerstone of Sartrean dialectic and ideology, expressed in theatrical form. There are, to be sure, other plays but they lack the relevance and directness of these four which, it is not unfair to suggest, were written to illustrate upon a stage employed as a place of action their author's favorite themes, somewhat vulgarized: In this absurd world of ours there are no spectators; we are all committed or "engaged," to employ an over-worked word of the Sartrean vocabulary; being (existence) is both prior and essential to having (possession); the presence, life and regard of the "other" is somehow decisive for each one of us as an individual, an ego. A vocabulary of Sartrean expressions now exists, but an analysis of its content belongs elsewhere. Besides, its utility, objectivity and validity have always been subordinate to Sartre's intervention in the political reality of the day (he is an acknowledged master at this), to the taking of a "position" and the offering of solutions.*

The background which has led to the development of this philosophy, with its theater and its attitudes, as well as a substantial school of literature, is well known. As is usually the case, we cannot deduce either an explanation or an understanding by simply citing its elements: the vague anti-fascism of European intellectuals, the German occupation, the resistance movement, the post-war disillusionment and descent from high hopes, the rise of Stalinism and its partner, European neutralism. It must be noted, however, that Sartre never writes of a revolutionary epoch itself, something which appears alien to his ready intelligence. The series of novels, plays and stories which, in turn, illustrate the more abstract workings of Sartrean phenomenology, are concerned with either the period of confusion and moral bewilderment which precedes a revolutionary period, or its counterpart; the disintegration and collapse which follows upon defeat and resistance to defeat.

* Until 1950, Jean-Paul Sartre was one of the most notable of a group of left-wing writers, critics, and artists who were part of the **Rassemblement Democratique Revolutionnaire**, a democratic, political, revolutionary anti-Stalinist organization which was active in French politics. It conceived of its mission as a regrouping and integration of left-wing forces in France who were alien to Stalinism. It regarded De Gaulle as well as the Communist Party as enemies of freedom and socialism in France. The Communist Party of France was regarded by the R.D.R. as a working class party with bureaucratic deformations, and as subservient to the Kremlin. It felt also that the masses of the Communist Party of France as well as of the S.P. were capable of being influenced by genuine revolutionary socialist ideas. The R.D.R. had a strong following among the Paris intelligentsia and among some sections of the working-class left but became inactive recently and disbanded. — The Editors.

"Neither victims, nor hangmen;" this was the slogan of Albert Camus which best expressed the deep, if illusory, humanism of the French resistance movement. Less than a decade later, with that movement already a dim and perverted memory, Sartre's newest play, *le Diable et le Bon Dieu* ("The Devil and God Almighty"), changes this formula. "Accomplice, or hangman;" such is the iron law which expresses his anguish (we shall see that Sartre is an anguished man) before reality and history. Either we become accomplices of those who uphold the *status quo*, or we become hangmen despite ourselves, if we try to change it. This, it would seem to us, is both the sense and proposed justification for the new play.

Now showing in Paris with much success—a success in part guaranteed by its grossness, blasphemy and incomparable vulgarity—*le Diable et le Bon Dieu* is no doubt its author's most important work for the theater. It has variously been described as his *Faust*, his anti-Claudian *Satin Slippers* and other attributes generally reserved for the category of *chef-d'oeuvre*. The play has been built, mounted and presented with the care generally preserved for the construction and launching of a new, enormous, revolutionizing machine. Among the consulting engineers who participate are some of France's greatest actors, designers, costumers, decorators etc., not to mention the chief supervising engineer himself, the late Louis Jouvet. Rarely has the French theater known such an enormity which, during four (4) steady, word-filled hours from 8 PM sharp until midnight rumbles, gesticulates and turns on the stage of the Theater Antoine, overwhelming the audience in front of it. The theater program proudly informs us that it took 104 technicians, who worked a total of 19,400 hours to prepare the stage; that everything in the theater (except the play, of course) had to be rebuilt, enlarged; that 38 projectors, 600 yards of cable, 2,000 yards of cloth, 600 pounds of nails, a ton of paint etc. were required; that . . . in a word, as an unfriendly critic noted, Cecil B. de Mille and M-G-M have had their challenge!

It must be clearly understood that this mechanism is put into motion to demonstrate its author's thesis, and for no other purpose. Before considering what this is, however, and in view of the unlikelihood that the play will ever be presented to American audiences, we must detail its content and story at some length.

The Devil and God Almighty

The action of *le Diable et le Bon Dieu* takes place in Germany during the period of the Protestant Reformation and the Peasant Wars of the early 1500's. It is chaotic and troubled Germany during the struggle between Luther and Rome, side by side with the social struggles between peas-

ants, knights and landlords, the city communities, the Church etc. Luther, Melancthon, Thomas Munzer, Tetzl, Goetz von Berlichingen, Florian Geyer are some of the names associated with this epoch period of revolutionary struggles. At the start of the play* the noble, Konrad, is waging war against his suzerain, the Archbishop of Mainz. At the same time, the city of Worms has seized the occasion to revolt against its own Bishop and has imprisoned him and the clergy inside the city. Within Worms itself, an internal class struggle between the city *bourgeois* and the poor has broken out. The Archbishop of Mainz, to restore his power, crush the rebellious Konrad and the city of Worms, has enlisted the services of Goetz, bastard brother of Konrad and freebooting head of a band of knights, professional soldiers and pillagers. The bastard Goetz is the central figure of the play.

The Archbishop has just learned of the victory of Goetz over his brother, whom he has killed. But his joy in this news is tempered by his fear of Goetz, the uncontrollable. Will he now go his own way, pursue an independent course and, among other actions, insist upon besieging and destroying Worms? The Archbishop, satisfied with his victory, is ready to call matters quits and forgive rebellious Worms. The inhabitants of Worms, massed about the walls of their besieged city, learn of Goetz's victory. The *bourgeois* are prepared to capitulate to their Bishop and the Archbishop of Mainz, but they are prevented by the masses, led by a baker, prophet and revolutionary agitator, Nasty (sic!) who, instead, arouses them to murder their imprisoned Bishop and prepare the slaughter of 200 priests enclosed in a cloister. The stratagem is to prevent any conciliation, of course. But before he dies, the Bishop manages to give the key of a subterranean tunnel leading out of the city, to Heinrich, priests of the poor. He is the only priest permitted to circulate by the revolutionists. The dying Bishop orders Heinrich to give the key to Goetz, thus permitting him to enter and subdue the city. Heinrich is placed before the dilemma of betraying the people, or obeying the Church. He submits and leaves the city to seek Goetz. At the same time, Nasty, the revolutionary leader, secretly leaves the city to secure help by arousing the peasants (a workers' and peasants' bloc). He falls into the hands of Goetz.

A Study in Evil

The bastard-knight Goetz is surely one of the most monstrous characters ever produced and presented on the stage of a theater! We are introduced to this brigand, anarchist, professional doer-of-Evil ("Evil is my *raison d'etre*; I do Evil because Good has already been done . . .") within his war tent, surrounded by his captains and in the company of Catherine, his prostitute-mistress. Militarist, ("I am a soldier, therefore I kill), our friend Goetz is likewise a blasphemer and an atheist who taunts God on

every occasion. Only "I, God and the phantoms" exist, and Goetz defies God to stop his campaign of murder and destruction. From the moment of his appearance, the play and its development take their source from this rootless creature who belongs neither to the nobility nor to the "people." This frustrated monster, bursting with pride and anguish, is a psychopathic type who gloats upon horror, violence and destruction. The balance of the play is controlled by his personal struggle with God, his blasphemy, harranguing of the Almighty and his exposition of the Sartrean dialectic.

Heinrich, the priest torn between his people and the Church, immediately regrets his treacherous action. The sight of Goetz suffices for him to change his mind and refuse to surrender the key. At the same time, the captured revolutionary chief, Nasty, sees his proposal for an alliance ("Kill the nobles, and let us build a new city where equality shall rule.") mockingly rejected by Goetz. The offer of land and wealth brought by the banker emissary of the Archbishop is equally rejected. Instead, Goetz takes a series of lightning decisions: he will outstrip all his previous accomplishments in the realm of horror. First, he will torture and kill all those present (the banker, Nasty, Heinrich, etc). He will reduce Worms to ashes, and kill all those in the city: rebels and clergy; rich and poor. Finally, he will turn over his mistress Catherine to the collective rape of his warriors. Why? For his own amusement, to prove the validity of his depravity, to horrify the world, but above all else to defy God to stop him.

But brusquely the machinery of the play shifts into reverse; the gigantic equipment grinds to a halt and resumes in the opposite direction. Heinrich-Mephisto cleverly touches the most sensitive point of Goetz-Faust; his pride and arrogance. Does Goetz really believe he is an inventor and originator in the realm of Evil? But we are all Evil, miserable, doomed to Hell; not a man is capable of doing Good.

Goetz — And so everyone does Evil?

Heinrich — Everyone.

Goetz — And no one has ever done Good?

Heinrich — No one.

Goetz — Fine. I'll bet you that I shall do it.

Recantation and Decision

A roll of dice decides the issue; Goetz bets against himself and loses; he has a year and a day to prove he can do Good. Worms is spared, the condemned are freed, the lands which Goetz "inherited" by murdering his step-brother are to be distributed among the peasants, a communist "City of the Sun" based upon Love, is to be built. But — and this is a key point in the play's meaning — Catherine tells us that Goetz deliberately lost his bet, he cheated himself in casting the dice; in a word, he chose the Good. Why this deliberate, if motiveless, reversal of the "general line", as a critic has humorously called it? Simply to permit the play to continue and develop its remaining thesis? No. This Goetz for all his horror-talk, his threats and his posturing, his blasphemy and defence,

(*) We are following the complete text of the play as published in the June, July and August 1951 issues of *Les Temps Modernes*; although minor parts of this text were omitted in the presentation. All extracts are from this source.

at bottom, a fraud! The priest Heinrich has seen through him, discerned that he horrifies himself most of all, and called his bluff. In his anguish before God and himself, the unhappy monster guaranteed his falling into the trap by cheating on himself. Thus ends the first act of *le Diable et le bon Dieu*. Touched in his pride, frightened by the very vehemence of his denial of God, drawn to the unknown, Goetz prepares to seek out the Good, "...invisible, on the other side of the wall."

Up to this point, however one may have reacted, the play has held our interest by its tension and action. It is of the theater. But two acts and two and a half hours remain. Critical opinion has been almost unanimous to agree that henceforth it loses its theatrical quality and degenerates into talk, ideologic affirmation and argument. The characters cease to develop and instead freeze into abstractions of the Sartrean viewpoint whose words quickly bounce off one another's hides. Except for isolated episodes, action ceases. Goetz, now dressed as a monk, lays siege to the realm of Goodness with the same desperate energy hitherto employed to do Evil. But his efforts, of course, are bound to fail; in fact, their objective consequences are more evil than ever before since this time they affect the "people"! Poor blundering utopian, in distributing his lands to his peasants he creates the danger of a premature general revolt of the peasantry which could become a blood bath. Nasty begs him to wait for "seven years" (we are at a loss to explain the choice of "seven"; a lucky number perhaps), but Goetz scornfully rejects this. He must build his "City of the Sun" now; today; he cannot spare a moment in doing Good. Nasty and Heinrich temporarily halt a premature uprising by terrifying the priests, driving them into hiding and thus preventing the holding of services. The peasants, in their ignorance and superstition, retreat. Goetz' attempts to win the sympathy of his peasants go unrewarded; Teizel and his friends give Goetz both a humiliation and a lesson when they sell the indulgences of Rome to the same peasants who turn their back on the man who has rewarded them with the coveted land. Goetz learns, and by a revolting ruse he wins them over. The dying Catherine, whom Goetz has now rejected in the name of chastity, is brought to a church where Goetz is present. She implores the now defrocked priest Heinrich to give her the last rites. Upon his refusal, Goetz seizes his opportunity and after an almost hysterical exhortation before the statue of Christ he pierces his hands with his own dagger. Now bearing the stigmata of the Lord, he appears before the peasants; they are his. An act of sincerity? Let us quote the words with which Goetz ends this scene: "I have had them. They're mine; at last."

Failure to Exorcise Evil

Now the "City of the Sun" can be built, with Love as its guiding spirit. Together with Hilda, an ill-defined figure who loves Goetz and whose role is to console the people whom she sees seduced by Goetz, a peasant-communist community is formed. But, like all such utopias, the bitter winds that swirl about it will not leave it in peace. Wanted

or unwanted, the generalized uprising of peasants against the nobles breaks out. The peasants are in process of being crushed; in bitter anger they turn upon the "neutralist" peasants of the Goetzian utopia and destroy them and their village. Goetz, flaying and starving himself in hatred of all mankind, lives in the ruins with the understanding Hilda. They await the appearance of Heinrich, come to "collect" his bet; Goetz's effort to do Good has met a complete check. But the end is not yet reached. Goetz may yet extricate himself from the disaster. Nasty, leader and ideologue of the revolting peasants, is already looking for a military technician who can command the peasant forces in their unequal battle with the trained nobles. But the obvious candidate must first undergo a spiritual purging before he can qualify; he must banish Mephisto, God and the Devil.

In a hallucinating scene between himself and the former priest, Heinrich, Goetz reaches the ultimate truth, after heavily drawing upon Nietzsche. Goetz affirms that he cheated and "invented" to betray Evil, but that a worse Evil was the only consequence. But in the midst of all this apparent Evil and injustice, together with this blocking of his obviously good intentions, how can we affirm the existence of the Almighty? Who has motivated and maneuvered all this vast campaign of Good vs. Evil? None other than he, Goetz, himself! What had God to do with it all? Had He ever given any sign of existence? Goetz formalizes his philosophic conclusions: God and Evil simply describe certain relations between themselves and God, the absolute; this "void above our heads"; this "hole in the earth." God doesn't give a damn for the things of this world. His sole effect is to embitter the relations between men by isolating them from each other. And the ultimate conclusion: "If God exists, Man is nothing; if Man exists . . .". Unlike Nietzsche, Sartre does not announce the death of God; he terminates his existence—a more drastic action! In the delirious joy of his discovery, Goetz announces the end of Heaven and Hell; henceforth, nothing but the Earth.

Heinrich, annihilated by this line of reasoning, infuriated by his inability to defend God, resorts to violence, that final response of all absolutists. But Goetz now draws his strength from the Earth he has just won. He stabs Heinrich. "The comedy of Good has ended with a murder." There remains only the resolution of the remaining ideologic and psychologic difficulties. All is quickly resolved.

"Hangman and Butcher"

In Hilda, Goetz finds the woman who will renew his former ties with the Earth; in his encounter with Nasty, he finds the solution to his political confusions. Nasty, to be sure, had patiently explained all this to him one year ago, but we learn only from personal experience. Goetz desires to be "... a man among men"; to love his fellows. He accepts the class hatred of Nasty, for "to love one another is to hate the same enemy." Nasty decides that Goetz shall head the army of the revolting peasants; in a final

tableau before the military chiefs of the peasants, Goetz takes command. His first act is to stab one of the chiefs who fails to display sufficient trust or confidence in him. Commands and threats tumble from his lips. "Proclaim at once that we shall hang any soldier who attempts to desert." "We will be sure of victory when your men will be more afraid of me than the enemy." ". . . I shall be hangman and butcher." And we quote the final words of Goetz, with which the play ends:

Don't be afraid, I shall not flinch. I shall horrify them since I have no other way of loving them; I shall give them orders since I have no other way of obeying; I shall remain alone with this empty sky above my head since I have no other way of being with you. There is this war to carry on, and I shall do it.

Thus, we conclude this sketch—often under the obligation of self restraint—of *le Diable et le Bon Dieu*. What is one to make out of all this? There is no denying a certain elementary strength and vitality in the play; Sartre never fails to pose strikingly those issues which divide men: power, the contemporary validity of tradition, the use of authority for coercion, etc. In narrower political terms, the drama of the bourgeois "intellectual" and his relation with the masses; or, to narrow the matter down to its true proportions, the relationship between the radical "intellectual" and the communist movement. This has been the one consistent theme of the Sartrian theater; the most disturbing problem of the European intellectuals (particularly, the French). In this play, Sartre has formulated more concretely than hitherto his solution; what a catastrophic reflection on the spiritual and intellectual life of Europe today! Let us see why.

Analysis of Various Themes

The various themes of *le Diable et le Bon Dieu* may be reduced to the following set of propositions. We may note, foreseeing a possible objection to this stripping of the play, that the characters themselves are treated by Sartre as representative of a particular thesis, with a corresponding development. Precisely this gives the play its wooden and mechanical motion, once the first introductions have been made.

First of all, there is the thesis according to which Good and Evil, one present within the other and inseparable, exist only as aspects of the domineering and reactionary relationship which God holds over the believer. The "humanization" of man, by Sartrian standards, demands the utter destruction of this theological doctrine; it is this concern which gives rise to whatever faint ties can be discovered between Sartre, the blasphemer, and Nietzsche, as well as other God-destroyers. Like Nietzsche, he proposes to pass beyond "Good and Evil," but he finds his subjective values (good and evil) only within those relations which exist between men, thus bordering again upon a semi-Marxist attitude. But how shall we decide our action, once God has been annihilated? It is here that a complimen-

tary thesis, that of the existentialist school of philosophy, is proposed.

The end of the play has indicated—perhaps without the author's awareness—a startling contradiction. God, who has separated men from one another, is dead—but Goetz is just as separated as ever from his fellow-men! Thus the need to "win" them still through terror and fear; as his final speech demonstrates. Who knows, perhaps he is more separated from them than ever before, since the common terrain provided by God no longer exists. At any rate, Herbert Luthy, in an excellent critique of the play published in the review, *Preuves*, has suggested Sartre's solution to this continuing dilemma as lying in the dramatic formula for action and life which is contained in the author's philosophy. "The play of a total arbitrariness, in which action is reduced to gratuitous gestures and intrigue to a succession of casts of dice. Man, claims Sartre, is his own creation; nothing is given to him, nothing is imposed upon him. . . . Nothing comes out of nothing; man is his own cause in each of his acts—*causa sui*."

Perhaps more important for Sartre than this conflict of religious belief which, despite its implications, remains rather abstract (even puerile) in the play, is the second, secular theme he propounds and which deals, in the concrete, with the relations between men. We have touched on phases of this theme; let us here formulate it more precisely. The personality of the individual may be rigidly deduced from his origin; activity, personality, behaviour etc.—all are determined, even in the case of isolated and ambiguous types like the bastard, Goetz. There can no longer be any question as to the strict determinism inherent in the doctrine of Sartre, and which was already suggested in *Les Mains Sales* (Hugo, son of a bourgeois, doomed by his "class" origin); his studies on anti-Semitism, the writer Jean Genet, etc. Twist and turn though he does, Goetz cannot break out of the framework imposed upon him by his dubious, alienating origins; after playing with Good and Evil for four hours, he recognizes the truth of the "class analysis" presented to him both, as regards his own reactionary role and the nature of German society at the period of the Reformation, by the baker, Nasty, within the first ten minutes of the play! But recognition of this "truth" cannot even change his consciousness, his personality, any more than acting accordingly (that is, taking over military leadership of the peasantry) can change his status! Poor Goetz, at best, he can only serve the cause of the proletariat-peasantry, never truly belong to it. His birth has determined this tragedy. Substitute for Goetz the entire European and world intellectual strata and you have arrived at Sartre's true attitude towards the intellectual. . .

Further Evidence of Sartre's Position

To support our view that *le Diable et le Bon Dieu* represents a disastrous descent into totalitarian depths, we must examine the play, if only briefly, at other levels. If it was Sartre's intention, from an historic standpoint, to provide an authentic background to the drama of Goetz and his alienated soul, then the result is laughable. There

is as little in common between the play and the epoch of the Reformation and the Peasant Wars of Germany, as there is between Goetz and Goetz vonBerlichingen, or Nasty, the baker, and the great, if neglected, Thomas Munzer. The Reformation was a period in which the issue of religion concerned itself with the most profound problems of religious belief, practice and enlightenment; not at all with the vulgarized blasphemy presented by Sartre. The conflict between Luther and Rome, the new interpretations of the Bible, pushed to their limits by Munzer and his friends, find no echo in this play. Even the internal relations between differing tendencies of the Reformation are misrepresented and cheapened by Sartre, as an extract from a letter addressed to Luther and Melancthon by Thomas Munzer, indicates:

Lieben Bruder, lasst euer Warten und Zaudern, es ist Zeit, der Sommer ist vor der Tur. Wollet nicht Freundschaft halten mit den Gottlosen, sie hindern dass das Word nicht wirke in voller Kraft, Schmeichelt nicht euren Fursten, sonst werdet ihr selbst mit ihnen verderben. Ihr zarten Schriftgelehrten, seit nicht unwillig; ich kann es nicht anders machen.

We have the right to question the legitimacy of an author's extracting certain elements of a complex historic situation, which has been studied and analyzed at great length by important historians, in order to provide himself with a convenient backdrop to his thesis. This is "theater with a message" at its worst, particularly if we realize that even that historic element extracted by Sartre is distilled into a thin essence which bears an exact affinity with the contemporary world as seen by the school of Russian and Stalinist-influenced intellectuals; that is, the "progressive" world of the masses, led by the allwise leader, versus the grey, "reactionary" mass formed by the rest of us. This historic falsification and distortion assumes a sharper form when we examine in greater detail the leading "personalities" of the play. If Goetz cheats on himself deliberately, so he may test that inner force of his which commands him to do "Good," it is equally true that Sartre stacks the cards in his favor and against God; in favor of his thesis and against his audience.

Goetz: Tool of History

In part, this is obvious and has been noted by many critics. All the play's characters are pale figures alongside of Goetz who has a working monopoly on all the cleverer and more penetrating lines; Goetz's opponent and "contradictor," the semi-priest, semi-friend of the poor and total *miserable* is a caricature. Heinrich is unworthy of the slightest credence. He belongs to the Devil and his sympathy for the poor is hypocrisy. "I dreamed of doing Evil and when I saw you I realized that I was going to do it in

* "Dear Brothers:

Leave off with thy waiting and irresolution; it is time, summer stands before the door. Willst thee not bring to an end friendship with the godless; they thwart the Word from acting in its full strength. Flatter not thy princes, or thee, too, shall perish with them. Be not reluctant, thee sensitive scribes; I cannot set about it otherwise."

truth. Do you know that I hate the poor?" As Goetz's religious adversary, his resistance vanishes at the first sign of the coming of atheist wisdom, vanquished by a few puffs of blasphemy and materialism. Whatever opinion one holds on these issues, Sartre has substituted a polemical consciousness for a dramatic consciousness. As polemist, he annihilates, belittles and paralyzes his opponent. But a true dramatic sense demands that the two opponents face one another as equals, with equal weapons and an equal chance — whatever the author's opinions may be — and that both live throughout the drama, with an equal profundity and intensity. Heinrich, as advocate and defender of the existence of God, is rather like one of those notorious lawyers who defend the accused in totalitarian countries. His "client" is guilty, to be sure, but he pleads extenuating circumstances, such as indifference to the world of men. In this respect, the defense of God is never presented and hence the absurdity to discuss this play on the same level as that of the religious plays of Claudel, for example. Francois Mauriac, whatever one may think of his beliefs, is justified in denying even the credit of true blasphemy to Sartre, whom he contrasts unfavorably in this respect with Andre Gide. The discoveries of Sartre-Goetz are either banal, or beside the point, or — worst of all — lead to conclusions which terrify one, once we have caught our breath and considered their sense.

And it is on this question of the Sartrean vision of our world, which is, after all, the central matter of the play, that we wish to conclude our analysis. Consider then: Goetz has deliberately chosen the road of doing Good, and has done his best (including charlatanism and trickery) to attain this end. God, the ingrate, refuses to recognize his good intentions and places obstacle after obstacle in his path. (Considering that the whole effort began in fraud, can one "blame" His refusal?) Finally, the utopian city of Good, constructed by Goetz, is destroyed, proving the viewpoint held by Nasty and Hilda. (Is, incidentally, Sartre thus expressing his opposition to the "neutralist" viewpoint, and the doctrine of "building socialism in one country"?) The edifice collapsed, Goetz wrestles with Heinrich-God and kills him. (We note the well-known fact that precisely the same arguments employed by Goetz to destroy the existence of God can and have been used as formal arguments to prove the contrary, His existence). Hilda, the most rigid of the play's characters, who finds "... joy an obscene thing, and those who are happy, alone," leads him to the revolutionist, Nasty. Goetz experiences the one faintly human moment of his life in this instance of confusion and discovery. God vanquished, he wants to rejoin his fellow-men. He rejects the offer of leadership made to him. "Leaders are alone. I want to see men everywhere, around me, above me — let them hide heaven from me. Nasty, let me be just anyone." Nasty, the all-powerful revolutionary chief, who dispenses his "class justice" as readily as he issues commands and delegates power, naturally refuses. Goetz's cure from the malady of God-drunkenness cannot take the form of a sentimental humanism. This manipulator of men and technician of revolutions, this self-appointed "father of the people" who has already told us that, "No one else than I has the right to speak in their

(the poor) name," quickly sets things right, and assigns Goetz his proper place.

The Totalitarian Man

We have already noted the diligence and responsiveness of the latter in accepting his new role. Isn't Nasty, then, intended to be the real hero of the play; this totalitarian caricature of a "People's Commissar"? From the first moment, all the threads were securely held in his hands; the play is tidily wound up with himself in perfect control; even Goetz finally recognizes this. But Nasty is Stalinist, totalitarian man in the fullest sense; he knows no scruples, even letting himself be rubbed by the magic wooden hand of a witch who thus makes men "invulnerable." He never hesitates to proclaim his belief in the doctrine of his ends being justified by any conceivable means. The very vulgarity of his behaviour would seem to justify our belief that Sartre has deliberately drawn him in such an extreme fashion so as to leave no possible doubts concerning his conclusions — the future belongs to totalitarian man. "We must kill in order to enter Heaven," someone says at the beginning of the play; the future is bloody with war, civil strife and the blindest of conflicts, but the "City of Man" will emerge from the heap of skulls and corpses, Sartre concludes. The man who survives this will not be Goetz, an instrument of history, but Nasty, the true leader of men — without scruple, intelligent, analytic, humorless, colorless — *Stalinist man*.

The difference of Sartre with the official Communist movement are skin deep, and largely due to the intransigence of the Party and its refusal to accept certain tenets attached to Sartrism. Little wonder, then, that Sartre has refused to support movements for investigation of alleged Russian slave labor camps, and is capable of writing in his preface to a recent book* that "... we cannot even say that a worker *joins* the Communist Party; we must say rather that he is born into it, for to be a proletarian and to be a Stalinist is one and the same thing." (pg. xlii)! The Communist Party (our friend, Nasty) thus becomes the only legitimate expression of the social conscience; this is the one consistent thought of *le Diable et le Bon Dieu*, with its story of a universe ruled by horror, brutality and chicanery. Through the medium of Nasty, those objectivities can — perhaps be used for set purposes.

Methodology of Sartre

The totalitarian Sartre is completed by the anti-humanist Sartre who, in substance, burns with contempt for the masses he proposes to save. We see this in Nasty, the juggler not of individuals but of entire layers of mankind; it is reinforced by the passivity with which the peasants are presented throughout the play. Not once do they have their say, or put forward their own spokesman. There is no evidence that Sartre has advanced one step in closing the gap between "intellectual" and "mass," the human problem which seems most disturbing of all to him. On the contrary, in a scene where the peasants of Goetz's utopian

community are learning their "lessons," the catechism of Goetzism, so to speak, we are given a shocking illustration of the author's methodology in establishing "contact with the people." A Goetz-appointed leaders of the catechism conducts exercises in recitation and spelling out the Word, according to Goetz. The sheepish peasants, like little children in an old-fashioned elementary school, repeat letters and words which have no meaning to them. To place in its proper frame this vulgarity of Goetz, one should examine the famous sketches and lithographs made by Kaethe Kollwitz describing the revolt of the German peasant masses. There is a deep contempt for men in the work of Sartre, particularly its recent evolution.

"Love of humanity" in the abstract is a dangerous thing, writes Herbert Luthy. It so easily justifies all sort of crimes against men in the concrete. This final judgment against Sartre must be accepted; there is much in the play which we cannot see too clearly, but this is clear enough. We should like to add to this a significant reminder which perhaps escaped the attention of the author. Not only did the historic Goetz lead to defeat that section of the peasant army which he commanded, but — as we are informed in Engel's well-known study of the German peasant wars — as a consequence of his deserting his troops on several occasions, he was known as the *Verraeter der grosse Haufen*, or traitor to the people.

STANLEY PLASTRIK

TRUE OR FALSE?

- ☐ The effective way to oppose war is to REFUSE TO BEAR ARMS.
- ☐ Refusal to kill your fellow man is a POSITIVE ACT of human decency.
- ☐ The alternative to suicidal war in the atomic age is NONVIOLENT RESISTANCE.

TRUE OF COURSE! IF YOU AGREE, JOIN OUR RANKS. If you still have doubts, write for copy of "WHICH WILL IT BE — G.I. OR C.O.?" and other literature:

war resisters league

5 Beekman Street, New York 38, N. Y.

Enrolling war objectors since 1923

* *Le Communisme Yougoslave*, by Louis Dalmas.

American Foreign Policy: Two Views

For Support of the Atlantic Pact

IT IS UNLIKELY that anyone nowadays has any illusions about the Soviet Union excepting perhaps the Communists and their allies. Internally, it is a brutal tyranny whose exploitation of the individual is as ruthless as was the Nazis'. Externally, it is an expanding imperialist state that today threatens the freedom and security of the world.

The major cause of tension and divisions among the Great Powers in the last six years has been the Soviet ambition to achieve world mastery through a combination of military and internal subversion. The Russians have never denied the fact that for them there are only two kinds of worlds the communist world, to be under complete communist control, and the anti-communist world to be treated as an enemy. The policy of forcing Russian rule on as many states as possible and of undermining all others is not a reaction to any "capitalist conspiracy." It dates back in execution to the end of World War II and in theory to the earliest days of Bolshevik rule.

The defeat of Germany and Japan and the serious weakening of other European countries in World War II, have shifted the world balance of power in favor of the Soviet Union. It emerged from the war as the strongest power in Europe and Asia in terms of territory, industrial resources and military strength. Under these conditions, the Soviet Union has been able to strike out on a program of imperialism. What followed as a result of World War II was simply the unfolding of a policy already determined by Communist theory, which postulates that there is an unyielding conflict between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world and that wars are inevitable as long as capitalism remains. The plans of Soviet conquest can be gathered from the writings of the Communist leaders themselves. In the *Problems of Leninism*, which is as frank in its declaration of policy as Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, Stalin openly says that "it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period of time side by side with imperialistic states—ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable."

Obstacles to Peaceful Settlement

This outspoken hostility against the nations outside the Soviet orbit has prevented any peace settlement between Russia and the Western nations. Peace conferences have shattered the illusion about the chances of striking a compromise with the Soviet Union. On a few occasions, the Soviet leaders have talked, they have given the pretense of negotiating, but they have granted no concessions and each concession granted to them has been a prelude to further demands. They have regarded agreements with

the West as expediences, only to be broken when they stood in the way of territorial and political expansion. In their code of morality, every lie, ruse and cunning are justified on the grounds that it advances the aims of world revolution. As long as the present Stalinist regime remains in power, it cannot conceive of relations with the West other than an armed truce; and there is little hope for expecting any change in men who believe that history is moving in their favor.

In contrast to the Soviet Union, the United States and the European nations have shown a high level of political morality. Undoubtedly, they have committed mistakes, supported unworthy groups and movements, been inconsistent and lacked foresight, but they have not been responsible for the worsening of world relations since 1945. In fact, so far were the Western nations from undertaking a postwar career of imperialism, that they went to great lengths to appease Stalin. The West believed that appeasement would shatter the design of conquest which was deeply rooted in Communist thinking.

Comparison of Russian and American Policies

It was only the unfolding of Soviet imperialism after World War II that shifted Western public opinion from a mood of surrender to Stalin to one of hostility and suspicion. The United States emerged from the war as the strongest power in the world. It possessed a combination of land, air and naval power that could have challenged the Soviet drive for world mastery. But the American people and government, far from wanting to get involved in the affairs of Europe, disarmed hastily. The desire of America was to withdraw into the national shell and keep clear of quarrels and entanglements of a world full of strife. There was no postwar expansion of American or British territory or influence compared with the Soviet annexation, in Europe alone, of lands occupied by twenty-four million people and domination of a wide range of satellites with more than one hundred million people. The few islands which America acquired in the Pacific were for purposes of defense, not imperialist exploitation. During World War II and immediately after, the United States placed the limitation of armaments high on its list of peace objectives. The majority of the American people, without distinction of political party or economic interest, supported the Baruch plan to outlaw atomic warfare.

There could hardly be a sharper contrast than these American actions on the one hand and Soviet imperialism on the other. The United States, it must be admitted, has committed acts which have aroused Russian suspicion and fear. It may commit more and worse, but by the low standards of most nations, especially of the Soviet Union, it has shown self-control and even enlightenment.

The British, under an anti-imperialist labor government, reduced, not expanded, their overseas empire. They gave India, Burma and Ceylon self-rule on a national scale and granted a large measure of independence to their

colonies. Whether Britain was motivated by virtue or by necessity is a fruitless argument. The fact that it did dissolve so much of her empire compares favorably with the postwar record of Soviet expansion.

Recognizing the strength of Russia, communism and Stalin's drive for conquest, the West has committed itself to a policy of military containment. The practical application of such a policy to Western Europe is clear. It involves the military integration of Western Europe along the lines of the Atlantic Pact. It demands a small mobile military force to discourage breaches of the peace and to halt Soviet aggression when it occurs.

Appeasement or Rearmament

It is psychologically difficult for democratic nations to rearm. To democratic thought in the West, military preparations seem the equivalent of mobilizing for war. It is a disturbing moral question, approached with discomfort and accepted with grave misgivings. Military rearmament, however, is aimed at preventing the outbreak of aggression and creating "positions of strength" on the basis of which a *modus vivendi* can be reached with Russia. Its object is peace, not war; agreement, not conquest.

Consider the alternative to military containment. Hitler taught the West the folly of appeasement. Surrender only reinforced his desire for conquest. Appeasement is doomed to failure with Stalin, as it was with Hitler, because a dictator despises weakness and respects strength. While the Nazi and Communist policies are not similar in their tactics, they are alike in their ultimate ambition. Hitler wanted war for its own sake. The immediate aim of Soviet foreign policy, however, is to strengthen itself for the expected world struggle and to weaken the enemy by a combination of local aggression and internal subversion short of war. Stalin has shown that his strategy is tempered with realism. He will neither challenge odds that are too great for him nor take risks when the opposition is too strong. Yet it does not follow that the Communist reaction to appeasement would be any different from Hitler's. If the Soviet leaders believed that no military opposition would be encountered, whatever they did, they might also succumb to the desire to expand.

One of the major factors responsible for peace today is the Korean war. The West's response to Soviet aggression in Korea was bold and swift. It served notice upon the Russians that force would be met with force. If America, backed and supported by the free world, had not taken up the challenge offered in Korea, one military aggression would have led to another until at last delayed resistance would have meant total war. The political consequences of allowing the Communists to absorb South Korea, unmolested, would have undermined the West's morale and will to resist.

Lessons of the Korean War

The Korean war has shown the danger of leaving the West a military vacuum, deprived of the means of self-defense. It revealed the weakness and inadequacy of the West's military preparations and underlined the fact that Western Europe was an easy target for Russian invasion.

Communist aggression in Korea provided a spur to military rearmament and stimulated the Atlantic Pact nations into action on a larger scale.

This policy of armed preparedness places many stresses on the West. It is very trying to the temper of democratic states because the people's desire for peace makes them impatient with half-peace and unwilling to accept its responsibilities. If Russian hostility remains unchanged and if it is expressed in further acts of aggression, there might be the temptation to force Russia into an all-out war. On the other hand, there is the danger that any Russian gesture of friendship will lull the West into the belief that special exertions or continued defense were unnecessary. The West would no longer feel the need to build up its defensive strength. But if a middle course can be steered between total war and complete disarmament, if the West can muster the strength, resolution and steadiness of nerve, if the Western diplomats can find some basis of agreement with the Soviet Union, then there is hope that time will bring a letup in the cold war.

Military containment is an essential but negative side of an effective defense. Any dynamic program for peace must be accompanied by a more positive and constructive policy. The purpose of military containment is to gain time in order to put such a policy into effect.

Challenge to the West

Communism, unlike any other totalitarian philosophy, offers a unique challenge to the West. It has gained the support of millions throughout the world because of the conditions which breed poverty, exploitation and suffering. The Communists appeal in the name of justice and security to the underprivileged. They have seized every chance to pose as the champions of the hungry and oppressed. Their propaganda promises a new life for all: employment, security and freedom from exploitation. During the last few years, the West has shown that it understands this challenge to some degree. Its policy for world peace has not only been military security, but economic reconstruction. World recovery and economic stability have received a high priority in its policy.

In Europe, the Marshall Plan was the example of a positive and enlightened American effort to contain communism. Because of this act of American statesmanship, Communism was halted in Europe and a pattern of recovery and order was brought out of the war's aftermath of poverty and confusion. The Marshall plan was not a project of American capitalists who regarded it as a condition of their own survival. On the contrary, the most reactionary fringes of capitalism were against it. Nor did America turn the Marshall plan into an attempt to reestablish capitalism in Europe. It gave economic aid under the plan to countries which ranged in their economic policies from socialist Britain to conservative Belgium. It is true that the Marshall plan had elements of greed and self-interest. But that was not the important fact about the plan. What was significant was the understanding it showed and the contribution it made to Europe's economic revival. The major failure of the plan was that while it won success in increasing production and wealth,

it did not bring about the proper distribution of that increase among the workers.

West's Economic Program for Asia

In Asia and Africa, America and Great Britain have put forward Point Four and the Colombo Plan which history may judge as the most positive acts of their leadership. Both these measures are aimed at raising the standard of living of the people in the underdeveloped countries and at removing the conditions which invite communism. However, the West's war against poverty in Asia and Africa has bogged down in an intensified race for arms. The greatest armament program ever undertaken in peacetime has been set in motion while no effort has been made to relieve the hunger and poverty of millions. Perhaps greater expenditures for economic security in the underdeveloped countries and less money for arms would rally the peoples' support for the struggle against communism. The United States has not inspired enough enthusiasm for freedom to counteract the masses' distrust of the West. Without this economic aid, the people of Europe and Asia might not be able to help us resist communism, however much they may want to. Certainly the magnitude of the West's military budget would not mean much without a new spirit which a merely negative program of rearmament alone would not bring forth.

American policy which forces the people to accept native reaction is not likely to strengthen the West's position either. American diplomacy must make it evident that it is more devoted to democracy than to fanatical opposition to communism. It must ally itself with the forces of democracy and prove by deeds that its policies are worthy of support. The admission of non-democratic states like Franco Spain into the anti-communist alliance gives plausibility to the Soviet charge that America is "fascist" and "bent upon war." The support of Chiang Kai-shek, the revival of cartels in Germany, the backing of reactionary cliques in Europe and Asia—all these measures deprive the West's rearmament program of its vitality and popular appeal.

Limitations of Western Policy

It is impossible to defend the West's anti-communist policy in all its aspects. Its weaknesses, as seen through Socialist eyes, are all too manifest. Yet it would be a tragic mistake to regard the cold war as a power struggle between capitalism and communism. The present world conflict is between democracy with all its human imperfections and totalitarianism with its denial of human values. Socialists who urge a Third Force are toying with a dangerous idea, morally irresponsible and utterly impractical. They are unable to make the most elementary distinction between a democracy, however imperfect, which is capable of progress toward a just society and despotism which is the implacable enemy of all forms of democracy, including democratic socialism.

The only course for the Western nations to follow in the future is to do everything that is necessary to make it clear that they both can and will defend the free world and prove within that world that their way of life is richer,

more enduring and more attractive to mankind than the practices and values of communism. It is on this task that the West must concentrate if peace and freedom are to survive.

GABRIEL GERSH

Gabriel Gersh is a member of the National Committee of the Student League for Industrial Democracy.

For the Democratic Fight Against U. S. and Russian Imperialism

THERE ARE FEW people in the United States today, outside the ranks of the Communist Party and its periphery, who have any illusions about the nature of Russian society. The same cannot be said, unfortunately, for many liberals and ex-radicals in their growing illusions about, and subservience to, American imperialism. Among many "advanced" political circles, it has become quite fashionable to rationalize and accept American foreign policy; it is considered outmoded, archaic, to attribute imperialist ambitions and actions to the American ruling class. Imperialism, we are told, is a thing of the past so far as America is concerned — an obsolete concept, desperately clung to by stubborn doctrinaires. The readiness with which these "new" evaluations are accepted among academic circles provides a disturbing contrast to the political acumen and social rebelliousness of the intellectual and academic world of the thirties.

Those who accept the Marshall Plan as benevolent and the Atlantic Pact as no more than a nation's justifiable instinct of self-preservation at work usually point to the following facts as proof of America's non-imperialist role: 1) America has few possessions 2) There is no wide-spread move for annexation and colonial empire 3) American export of capital comprises but a small fraction of her total national product.

Various Forms of Imperialism

Interestingly enough, inherent in this argument which denies America's imperialist role today is an acceptance of the concept of modern capitalist imperialism as the inescapable politics of an advanced bourgeois nation plagued with the problem of over-production and forced to find markets for capital export and investment. But this form of imperialism is not the *sine qua non* of imperialist drives. Imperialism in its more generic sense, refers to the imposition of the needs and ambitions of the ruling group of one nation over that of weaker, foreign peoples through any number of means; physical force, economic power, political maneuvering, etc. We know of the imperialism of a slave society such as ancient Rome, the imperialism of the modern anti-capitalist Russian system which also does not export capital, and the imperialism of advanced capitalist nations.

The fact that the United States does not export a larger

percentage of capital to foreign lands is not proof therefore, of its alleged non-imperialist character. Nor is the equally correct assertion that the United States does not seek outright possession of colonies, and in some cases actually lent tacit support to native independence movements, evidence of anti-imperialist policies. On the contrary, they are aspects of a very real and dangerous imperialism developing out of America's unique history and her position in world affairs today.

Although, as we have already agreed, America's export of capital involves only a small percentage of her total national product, it nonetheless remains a vital and immediate factor in maintaining economic stability. Exports have declined in relative importance, but that is by no means any confirmation of the thesis that foreign trade and investments are of merely incidental importance to the United States. If the U.S. were suddenly cut off from export markets and sources of needed imports the results would be catastrophic for our economy.

If There Were No Foreign Trade

The elimination of existing foreign trade would mean the virtual elimination of certain industries. The collapse of these industries would, in turn, have dire effects on related fields which are not themselves dependent on the foreign market. For example, in 1948-49 a quarter of the total production of cotton, wheat and tobacco went for ECA subsidized exports.* Similarly, an enormous amount of machine tools, agricultural equipment, military goods and food products find profitable outlets in Marshallized overseas trade. A report published by the Brookings Institute last year can summarize our claim:

Although American foreign trade is small in comparison with national output, it affects large sections of industry and labor and provides an outlet for large and steadily expanding productive capacity. A decline in foreign sales would have an adverse cumulative effect on the rest of the economy because of the close interrelationship among all parts of the economy.

What is also deceptive in the percentage-wise small figure of American export is that it does not consider the much larger profit derived from goods sold to, and finance capital invested in foreign lands as compared with domestic markets and investments. Finally, the termination of foreign exchange would mean forced unemployment of millions who are working for corporations which are filling overseas military and civilian orders.

The point made that the United States is not seeking colonies is disingenuous in its naivete. Of course, the United States is not seeking colonies. More than that, except for a brief period in American history when the country first embarked on a policy of imperialist expansion, the United States has hardly ever sought to extend its power through the acquisition of foreign territories. That is too troublesome, too expensive and too transparent. Instead, the United States has pursued the policy of intervening, influencing and determining the development of foreign lands through

* For a fuller discussion of this section of the article *Anvil* readers are referred to Sam Bottone's article, "Ends and Means of Welfare Imperialism" in the Spring, 1951 issue.

her tremendous economic weight and strategic political position.

The industrial revolution did not take place in the United States until after the Civil War. It was only after the 1890's that manufactures outweighed agricultural production. What this meant was an American industry which was capable of beginning with the latest technical inventions, innovations and techniques, with a labor market well provided for through immigration. In addition, the United States had a highly favorable geographic position: an enormous land area, rich in natural resources, which could be developed with relative quiet by a new and voracious class of industrial capitalists. Thus, while the mercantilist and early capitalist development of European powers was characterized by an endless succession of wars of annexation with backward areas, followed by conflicts among themselves over the division of the world market, the United States was permitted an easier and more peaceful growth. America was reaching its zenith when its exhausted European competitors were beginning to fall apart at the seams. A mighty industrial America had no impetus to seek colonies. Furthermore, the colonial world was already divided among the major European powers at the time American capitalism felt the growing pressures for markets for capital export and investment. Territorial acquisition, then, on any significant scale would have entailed costly conflicts with Europe. But if a colony were freed from the grip of the European power its borders could then be all the more easily penetrated by American capital. No fuss, no bother, no unnecessary, unprofitable bloodshed and the American ruling class is afforded an opportunity to wear the hypocritical mask of a world humanitarian, fighter for the independence of colonial peoples. A profitable business all around, and the explanation for the anti-colonialism of American imperialism.

What we have said about American imperialism thus far has been, in our opinion, generally true for decades. This does not mean that there is nothing new in the situation. In the past ten years there have been new and profound changes in the inter-relations of government, private capital and foreign policy.

The Growth of State Imperialism

American imperialism today is certainly different from the imperialism described by Lenin 30 years ago. In a sense it is entering upon a new stage. Alongside the continued exploitation of foreign lands by private capital, there is, today, the growing intervention of the state which poses a threat to the maneuverability of private capital. The reason for this is fundamental to an understanding of world politics today and for an answer to what political attitude a democrat and socialist must adopt in the Russian-American struggle for world power.

The theory that the state is the executive committee of the ruling class has no clearer substantiation than the history of American foreign policy between the Spanish-American War and World War II. During that 40 year period, the Open Door policy and dollar diplomacy were governmental strategies clearly designed to permit the expansion of private American capital. Finance capital and

government particularly during the first half of this period achieved, in actual practice, the maximum of harmony and understanding.

But since the beginning of World War II an increasing note of discord has been injected into this, heretofore, good old American teamwork. This discord, bringing with it an incipient new form of imperialism has been engendered by the tentacular expansion of a new social order, Stalinism. The struggle between the capitalist world and the Russian empire has no precedent. The Great War and World War II had one fundamental common denominator: they were conflicts between rival blocs of capitalist nations and the victory of one could not aim at the immediate *social* annihilation of the other. The stakes in the third war that is being organized are much greater. The victory of Russia would spell the end of capitalism as a world system; the objective of the United States would be the crushing of Stalinism as a viable social order. Preparations for this war between two contradictory social classes calls for new and more audacious methods. No matter how backward the political administration in Washington may be, the very exigencies of the situation will force upon it a social perspective which will bring it into ever sharper conflict with whole sections of the capitalist class. The private capitalist is primarily interested in one thing: profit, foreign investments are made by private concerns for the same noble purpose. The capitalist politician (statesman, if you insist) must have a broader view of domestic and foreign problems. His fundamental responsibility is to preserve the existing social order. From the turn of the century until the middle of the 30's there was little to upset the tranquil relations between private overseas investors and Washington administrations. This tranquility has now been considerably disturbed by the Marshall Plan, the Point Four Program, foreign loans, etc. What is ironic is that in all these cases the private capitalist stands to gain. Were it not for the Marshall Plan and foreign loans, not only would world capitalism be that much weaker, but the assets of American manufacturers would be considerably smaller.

The Need for Freedom to Invest

The American businessman, partially for psychological reasons but mainly from economic motives wants to be free. He needs room to manipulate, to invest where he can reap the greatest profit, not to be hindered by extraneous political considerations. He wants and needs the protection of government, but he fears the *direction* of the state. Once he feels that he is told how much he can invest, where he can invest, the terms of his investment, his freedom is threatened. His profits may rise, but the means of guaranteeing his future are endangered. When the NAM objects to the Marshall Plan because it means a loss of freedom, it is expressing these fears.

With the irrepressible conflict between Russia and the United States daily becoming exacerbated, Washington is forced to make investments which are designed to pay off immediate *political* dividends. The Marshall Plan was not designed exclusively to put Europe back in its feet so that it could once again carry on normal trade relations with

the United States, and carry a heavy share of the rearmament load. And it was certainly not the product of humanitarian considerations. It had the immediate political objective of stopping Stalinism: of invigorating a demoralized European bourgeoisie and of instilling ideas about American benevolence in the European working class which was rapidly falling under the influence of Stalinism. Its success has been only minimal on these counts. To execute these large scale, politically oriented loans requires the full talents of the state. No private monopoly, no matter how powerful has either the means or the inclination to finance a Marshall Plan. For this, the state is indispensable; and precisely because the state is a political organization, it cannot place its trust in private capital to achieve a political objective which is of life and death importance.

Just as the private investor seeks the aid of the state in his foreign economic ventures, the state will make every effort to guarantee its own political investments. And this guarantee takes the form of imperialist intervention in the political and economic life of Europe. Here too, we see a new element in this phase of imperialist development: one time powerful European nations are being reduced to the status of unwilling subordinates of the United States. Independent capitalist Europe is finished. Its empires are shattered, its economy dislocated and whatever gains have been made toward recovery have been largely diverted by futile military efforts to maintain its empires and by huge armaments programs upon which Washington insists.

Through the various provisions of the Marshall Plan, American intervention in Europe is assured. There are the counterpart funds that must be laid aside and whose use must meet with the approval of American authorities; the U.S. must sanction the annual reports of the Marshall Plan nations; the threat of withholding funds has worked miracles in revising European trade restrictions which operated against American interests. Aside from the formalized provisions for American intervention, it should be clear that through America's ability to prop up European capitalism, the latter will bend to American demands. Anything is better than annihilation by the Russians, including the indignity of having a European army commanded by a West Point man.

American imperialism in Europe can be rationalized if you wish to, but its existence cannot be reasonably denied.

The Lesser Evil Theory

Perhaps we will have convinced our opponents in this debate that America is still an imperialist power. They may then say: "at least American imperialism is not as vicious as the Russian variety. Why not support American policies, then, if they are designed to eliminate the greater menace?" We will readily agree that American imperialism is the lesser evil to Russian totalitarianism. But it does not follow, therefore, that we must give our political support or endorsement to American imperialism in peacetime or in war. Let us bear in mind that by "support" we are discussing a political attitude and not the question of whatever physical contributions to the war effort the government may force upon us through conscription or a labor draft.

That is a problem which does not have any direct relevance to this discussion.

In the first place we do not support American imperialism on the "lesser evil" basis precisely because it is imperialism; and because it is imperialism, it cannot possibly defeat Stalinism except in a military sense; and for capitalist imperialism to defeat Stalinism in a military sense will not have eliminated Stalinism as a world political force.

Stalinism derives much of its strength from its ability to dishonestly pose as the champion of the people. It offers something new, utilizing all of its experiences and cunning with telling effect. And one half of its propaganda is the truth. When it denounces capitalism as a backward, reactionary system which has brought Europe to its knees, it is telling the truth. When it lashes America for its imperialist role it is telling the truth; when it describes the misery of the Asian people and the attempts of the American-led bloc to keep the nationalist movement in check, it is telling the truth. Naturally, the Russian regime will not tell the whole truth. No such power will commit political suicide. For to tell the full story it would be necessary to explain that Russia, far from being a worker's paradise, a land of well-fed, smiling workers and buxom peasant women, is a vast concentration camp.

But the propaganda of the Stalinists is nonetheless effective. The French and Italian worker may lend a sympathetic ear to criticisms of Russia but they *feel* the whiplash of capitalist exploitation and can thus be swayed by the clever half-truths of Stalinism. And all the Atlantic Pacts and Marshall Plans that American can concoct will never revive the faith of the European workers in the capitalist system, or persuade them to pay homage to American magnanimity. At most, the Marshall Plan can neutralize the Stalinist influence in Europe, it cannot decisively defeat its appeal.

In Asia, the appeal of Stalinism has proven even more effective. The entire colonial world is seething with discontent and rebellion. The demise of England as a world power, the social anemia of the French bourgeoisie, the weakened condition of Holland, combined with the increasingly intolerable conditions of life in the colonies have ignited the entire colonial world. Is it any wonder that Stalinism is making deep inroads in Asia? As with the European worker, the Asian peasant, student and intellectual, are not nearly as moved by a truthful description of totalitarian terror in Russia as they are by their bitter and intimate contact with Western imperialism.

American Allies in Asia and Europe

The United States, feverishly attempting to build a stable anti-Russian bloc is not going to encourage revolutionary nationalist movements. An independent Asia and the expulsion of the British and French from Africa will mean the further descent of capitalist Europe and definite decline in its value as "partner" in a war with Russia. The colonial movements have made it clear that they want a complete break from Western domination, including that of America. This bodes ill for Washington's political and military objectives and consequently it seeks allies among

the more conservative and reactionary forces in the colonial and semi-colonial world: Quirino, Rhee, Bao Dai, Chiang.

On the continent, American policy has thrown to the winds all pretenses at preparing for a military defense of democracy. Totalitarian Portugal, Fascist Spain, the Greek and Turkish regimes have all benefitted from this peculiar democratic crusade. And with each such move that Washington makes, the Stalinist propaganda machine obtains an automatic oiling. On the political front, capitalism is lost before the onslaughts of demagogic Stalinist propaganda.

American policy with regard to the colonies, German re-armament, welcoming Spain into the fold, her reactionary conduct of the war in Korea, is not an accidental phenomenon. A more liberal administration in Washington would be forced to follow, *in its essentials*, the same policies. It might be done with a little more sophistication and less rashness, but American imperialism in its preparations for total war with a more dynamic, though more brutal, Stalinist world, has to follow an inherently indicated reactionary course regardless of which cabinet is at the Washington helm.

Responsibility of Truman Administration

Domestically, the growth of state imperialism finds its counterpart in the garrison state. Men like McCarthy are the cause for much of the hysteria, but it is the "liberal" administration in Washington which is primarily responsible for the deep inroads being made into our democratic rights. The loyalty oaths, the purges and the "report your neighbor" psychology do not find their source in such utterly irresponsible reactionaries as McCarthy; they have been initiated and executed by the Truman administration. The garrison state with its war economy, militarization of civil life and hacking away at civil rights will continue to grow more dangerous as the cold war intensifies. That is not the way a democrat or a socialist would prepare to defend society against Stalinism. But there is no socialist or democratic regime in the White House. There is an imperialist regime in Washington whose social role and psychology will not permit it to make any fundamental deviation from its present reactionary course.

In preparing for a total, social war with Stalinism, capitalist imperialism must tighten up. Precisely because of the scope of the struggle and the dynamic nature of Stalinism which is capable of successfully appealing to large masses in the *enemy* camp, American imperialism seeks to secure its position by exploitation, decrees and witch hunts at home and must maintain a close supervision over European affairs. The working classes of Europe and America must be watched with particular care for their interests are most inimical to those of the bourgeoisie.

If one decides to support American capitalism in an imperialist war with totalitarian Russia, then squeamish considerations about principles and ideals must be largely tossed aside. For this would be total war, a fight to the death for capitalism, and to support it means to accept the responsibility of aiding American capitalism battle in the *only way it can* under the present circumstances.

Political Advantage Is Military

Stalinism would have the political advantage over the United States in a war. This advantage has more than propaganda value. It can have decisive military importance as is testified to by the Korean events. Whoever wins the willing support of the people has won half the military battle. In Korea this political advantage cancelled the superior firepower, armaments, naval and air power of the American forces. There is no reason to doubt that in a global war the same military-political advantage would accrue to the Stalinists.

Thus the reason that we must not support American imperialism bears repetition: it cannot defeat Stalinism politically and cannot defeat it militarily on a healthy, progressive basis. On the other hand, if the struggle against Stalinist barbarism were led by a world democratic movement, then such a militant, anti-imperialist Third Camp could break the hold of Stalinism over the millions it influences in Europe and Asia, at the same time removing the military trump card of the Kremlin.

A military victory of American led forces in the event of war would not end the danger of totalitarianism. On the contrary it would be as great, in Europe, as before the war. In a total war, the economic resources of Europe would be completely destroyed and along with them would go the last vestiges of capitalist order in Europe. And the forces of totalitarianism would thrive on the ruins and chaos of a

devastated Europe. Russia would be defeated, perhaps, but it would prove to be only a military defeat; and an anti-capitalist, totalitarian movement would find Europe an ideal spawning ground.

What else could become of a devastated Europe? Could democratic regimes emerge? But to develop a popular democratic movement we must counter Stalinist propaganda with the ideas and actions of anti-totalitarians who are at the same time genuinely opposed to unpopular capitalist regimes and to American imperialism; and not after the war, but now.

A world democratic movement can be organized. It already exists to one degree or another throughout the world; from the nationalist movements of Asia to the splendidly solid British working class. If these forces were to join hands, and cast off any existing illusions about even limited cooperation with either Russian or American imperialism, there could be created that army of millions, a world wide third force. This popular movement could deliver the coup de grace to Western imperialism in Europe and Asia, politically destroy the popular base of Stalinism outside the Iron Curtain and find adequate means for coping with threats from Russian totalitarian imperialism.

JULIUS JACOBSON

Julius Jacobson is the editor of Anvil and Student Partisan.

The Film Brought Into Focus

THE SATURDAY Review of

Literature has rather curiously forecast that John Huston's *The Red Badge of Courage* will end up as a classic. The film is a visual transcription of Stephen Crane's book of the same name, and stars Audie Murphy and Bill Mauldin. It narrowly misses being merely a sentimental vignette. We follow "the youth" (Murphy) from camp through his first battle. He is afraid, but does not run when he faces the first "Reb" charge; then he "skedaddles" when the second comes, creeps back to a column of wounded men, gets knocked on the head by a fleeing comrade, and finally arrives back in bivouac.

The youth's character is one-dimensional. The action of the film pivots on the main question of whether he will run, with its implications for his self-regard or lack of it. The story is ironical — for his behavior is contradictory and he is considered first dead and then a wounded hero by his comrade Mauldin, whereas he had merely skedaddled. Afterwards, he becomes a "real soldier" in another charge — fighting because he is "mad." And in the end, after victory, the troops march off, hoping a better world will ensue.

Story and Film Treatment

Cinematically, Huston has given us a dead-pan presentation of a Civil War battle, with something of the sweep and smoke of Griffith, though without the 3,000 horses. The war is treated, as Crane treated it, scenically; it is a vast, unpredictable affair, about which an individual soldier can take little thought. Huston is faithful to the text in centering the action upon the youth's conflict over his courage. As in the case of the rifleman who refuses to take cover ("I'll do my fighting standing up") the story deals with war as an environing factor which is taken as a dramatic matter of fact. In this sense both book and film a-moralize war; when Crane wrote his story, in the 1890's, he took a scrupulously "pure" view, artistically, of the psychological processes he was describing — though the temptation may have been strong to treat it as a moral war. War in the book as in the film is an interesting phenomenon in man's world — an element in the human situation. In *The Red Badge Of Courage* men are under stress, just as the men adrift are in *Open Boat*. They do not concern themselves with the war as a general political event, though it inaugurated population warfare and caused Sherman to give

us pretty much the last word on modern war.

It is partly because of this absence of "issues" that the film caused some audiences to laugh in the wrong places. The historical setting, moreover, is remote, and a certain quaintness of mood arises from Crane's slightly lilled dialogue, which is used verbatim. Murphy's performance also seems a bit overwrought. The audience, however, is to blame for its laughter, largely; for the film nowhere pretends to be a study of war — it deals with fear, with cowardice, with the intricacies of self-respect. Such a film would naturally seem odd to audiences accustomed to seeing war as an elaborately efficient business. War is now logistics. It is "killing gooks." Crane's story appears to us a little picturesque; it seems to take its protagonist too seriously, and in too small a view. If we react to it as sentimental, it is because the film asks us to feel more than we think is justified by the story.

It may be that it is increasingly difficult to involve us emotionally in stories of soldiering, past or present. It may be that our hostilities have been so successfully channeled that we are currently interested in only one war (which we do not want, of course). Or it may be that we find it embarrassing to be told that war is an affair of human acts and human emotions after all.

ERNEST CALLENBACH

PROGRAM of the NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR

The primary aim of the New York Student Federation Against War is to organize all students opposed to the war drives of Russian and American imperialism which threaten the very existence of world civilization. We aim to prevent the polarization of the American student body into either of these reactionary war camps.

We are irreconcilably opposed to the totalitarian tyranny which rules over such countries as Russia, her Eastern European vassal states and fascist Spain. We advocate the overthrow of these regimes by democratic forces from within these countries and enthusiastically endorse all such forces. At the same time we do not accept the rationalization and apology for the war drives of American imperialism on the basis of militarily stopping Stalinism.

In the United States, today, all of our democratic rights are seriously menaced. Above all, local and national government and big business have reached a political affinity in their attempts to stifle labor and radical organizations, and to virtually outlaw the Stalinist movement. This political reaction has its parallel in the academic world where one university administration after another has initiated campus witch hunts.

Racial and religious discrimination and persecution remains the shame of the nation. Jim Crow, in particular, remains largely unabated. The murder of Negroes in the South, their discrimination in Northern industry, the segregation policy in academic institutions have, by now, become characteristic of the social psychology of America's industrial and political leaders. It is the aim of the New York Student Federation Against War to conduct militant struggles for the complete social, political and economic equality of the Negro people.

The growing political reaction at home finds its counterpart in America's foreign policy: bolstering reactionary regimes in Spain, Greece and Turkey; the North Atlantic Pact and the subsidization of the military machines of Western Europe and support of German rearmament.

The New York Student Federation Against War

does not believe that war is inevitable. We are convinced that the drive toward war can be eliminated by building democratic political and social structures in place of America's growing garrison state and Russia's rapacious imperialism. It is to this end that we are dedicated.

As a student organization in the United States we have the following special and immediate role to play in building a just and democratic world:

1. Education: *As students we will make every effort to stimulate political and social thought on campus; to attempt to instill among the student body a sense of responsibility and self-confidence; to encourage discussion and debate of political issues and local campus political problems.*

2. Organization: *To present the particular views of the New York Student Federation Against War we urge all sympathetic students to make every effort to organize recognized college clubs; and, similarly, we urge all existing clubs sympathetic to the views of the Federation, and not already affiliated to it, to take immediate steps to join the Federation.*

3. Activities: *In addition to general political education the Federation proposes to its constituent clubs that they participate actively in daily campus political activity; to enter all struggles for the defense of student rights, to guarantee the right to organize on campus and to bear speakers of a club's own choosing; to fight against faculty or administrative supervision of student activities; to fight for an end to racial and religious discrimination on campus and in fraternities.*

4. Federation Activities: *In addition to local campus activities the Federation proposes intercollegiate campaigns to fight for democracy and peace through meetings, petition campaigns, education, etc. The Federation will conduct city wide actions in behalf of the fight to end Jim-Crow and to turn back the increasing assault on civil and academic liberties. The Federation will also seek out other student groups in an effort to conduct joint campaigns on such issues.*

BUSINESS OFFICE NOTICE

Individual students or clubs which wish to order bundles of ANVIL AND STUDENT PARTISAN to sell on campus should write the magazine's business manager for rates and conditions. All correspondence concerning business should be sent to the following address:

ANVIL AND THE STUDENT PARTISAN
247 LEXINGTON AVENUE **NEW YORK, N. Y.**

SUBSCRIPTION

Enclosed find \$1.00 for a 5 issue subscription to ANVIL AND STUDENT PARTISAN.

Name
Address
School

anvil

And Student Partisan

THE ELECTIONS: Rhetoric and Reality

Kermit Eby:

Labor's Political Future

Hemingway's Concept of Virility

Revolt in South Africa

The Fate of American Civil Liberties

Shaw and the Social Role of Drama

Spotlighting the National Campus Scene



Fall 1952

anvil a student anti-war quarterly and student partisan

Vol. IV - No. 3 (Whole No. 8)



Fall Quarter 1952

CONTENTS

Editorial: The Elections — Rhetoric and Reality	3
Bob Bone	
American Labor's Political Future	7
Kermit Eby	
Hemingway and the Concept of Virility	11
Arel Austin	
The Fate of American Civil Liberties	15
Harry Ludd	
The Revolution in South Africa	19
George Houser	
Shaw and the Social Role of Drama	22
Ernest Callenbach	
Spotlighting the National Campus	26
Bill Shirley, Bogdan Denitch, Gerald Carr, Alan Daniels	
Book Review: Irving Howe's "William Faulkner"	29
Fred Samuels	
Book Review: Ralph Ellison's "Invisible Man"	30
Leonard Prager	

EDITORIAL BOARD

Julius Jacobson, <i>Editor</i>	Bob Bone, <i>Man. Editor</i>	Pincus Gross
Abe Victor	Joan Reynolds	Sam Bottone
Robert Mussigman	Leonard Prager	Margaret Levi
John Thompson	David McReynolds	Scott Arden
John Holmes		Bogdan Denitch
	Al Davidson, <i>Business Manager</i>	
	David Senes, <i>Ass't Business Manager</i>	

ANVIL AND STUDENT PARTISAN editorials reflect the views of the majority of its editors. However, no single publishing club necessarily endorses all of the views expressed in the editorials. The magazine is published by the following student organizations:

NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR
41 West 33rd St. New York, N. Y.

SOCIALIST CLUB OF ROOSEVELT COLLEGE

POLITICS CLUB OF UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

FOCAL POINT OF YALE UNIVERSITY

SOCIALIST STUDY CLUB (UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS)

THE NEW PERSPECTIVES OF ANTIOCH COLLEGE

DETROIT ANVIL CLUB

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA YOUTH FEDERATION AGAINST WAR

A Letter to the Reader

Dear Friend:

The Choice is yours!

I know that you appreciate the value of Anvil and Student Partisan, both for the quality of its contents in politics and literature, and for its point of view on the war issue. Whether or not you agree with the position of the editorial board, you will usually find Anvil and Student Partisan stimulating and provocative. There is a real necessity to see to it that the magazine remains on the scene to do its job.

While the spirit is willing, as business manager I find that the flesh is a bit weak. In our social set-up the reference is of course to money. Without that we can't publish. Unlike you and me, the printer doesn't work without pay.

The current issue of Anvil and Student Partisan was delayed by a lack of funds. We don't want it to happen again. The only one who can guarantee against such a recurrence is YOU!

Funds must come from one of two sources: sales or gifts. The choice is yours! Which is it going to be? Are you going to get out and sell copies to your classmates, get your friends to subscribe, put the magazine on newsstands, or would you rather take the money out of your pocket?

I would not like to see that happen. Not that I pity you. If you don't have the good sense and initiative to do a job for such a magazine, you should "pay for it." However it is a much healthier basis for any publication to receive its income from bona-fide sales. So for the sake of your pocketbook and the health of the magazine, let's try to increase sales for this and coming issues.

Fraternally,

Al Davidson, Bus. Mgr.

CONTRACT

The undersigned hereby contracts for page advertisement to appear in the Winter issue of ANVIL & STUDENT PARTISAN at \$.....

Name of Advertiser

Street

City

Paid

Balance

Signed

Solicitor

Please attach copy on separate sheet

Full Page \$50.00

Half Page \$25.00

Quarter Page \$12.50

Eighth Page \$ 6.25

Booster ad \$.50

Editorial

The Elections: Rhetoric and Reality

THE STUDENT LIBERAL approaches the presidential elections equipped with blinders and a magnifying glass. The function of the blinders is to blot from his consciousness the issues which really matter: the bipartisan formula for "peace" — by means of a policeman's club; the construction of a permanent war economy; and the continuing assault upon our vanishing civil liberties. Such issues do not make good campaign material for the practical liberal, for he assumes that it is futile to oppose the main drift toward an American garrison state. He turns instead to "domestic" issues, to the quiet backwater of American politics, relatively untouched by the strong current of the main drift. Here perhaps some genuine differences between the major candidates can be discovered. Here the magnifying glass is an indispensable aid in the search for a lesser evil.

It is the task of a student anti-war publication to approach the presidential elections with a consistent and long-range perspective. We must tenaciously press the questions: "Where do the candidates stand on the major issues of war and civil liberties? Can the traditional 'two-party system' provide voters with an *alternative* to the main drift?" For us, the answer begins with an investigation of the recent history of the American political-economy.

(1) Toward a Permanent War Economy

The Great Depression of the thirties dramatically revealed the central problem of American capitalism: the chronic lack of purchasing power, sufficient to absorb the mass product of American industry. The New Deal attacked this problem from both ends: it *reduced* production by destroying wealth, and *increased* purchasing power by pumping it artificially into the economy, through "deficit-spending" by the government. This program ended in failure: the government could not find sufficient outlet for its funds without poaching on the traditional preserves of private enterprise. The country never really emerged from the depression until the period of "national defense" spending, for the only form of deficit-spending ultimately acceptable to private enterprise is armaments. The Roosevelt administration finally accepted war as a means of stabilizing the economy.

By the systematic destruction of wealth, war makes full production and full employment possible, without inducing "surpluses" threatening to the stability of a scarcity economy. A modern war of attrition destroys vast accu-

mulations of commodities and capital, creating a vacuum which cannot be filled until well into the postwar period. This was the economic service which World War II provided for the staggering American economy. These were the circumstances which permitted an increase in the gross national product from \$97 billion in 1940, to \$198 billion in the peak war year of 1944.

When at the end of the war, the government cut back on war orders, withdrawing a large segment of purchasing-power from the economy, the national product fell off to \$171 billion. Had it not been for the backlog of consumer demand, and the continuing astronomical level of military expenditure, a serious slump might have resulted.

The years 1946-48 saw the inauguration of the Marshall Plan, and the beginnings of American military aid abroad. This provided the Fair Deal with a kind of global deficit-spending policy, differing from the domestic spending of the New Deal only in geography, and in "anti-Communist" rationale. It stimulated an increase of the national product to \$202 billion in 1948, but was not sufficient to stabilize the economy. In 1949, the nation experienced unemployment and "recession," and the national product slumped to \$196 billion. The government then resorted to a classic solution for domestic crisis. Preferring a "strong" foreign policy to radical domestic change, the Truman administration embarked on its Korean adventure. This restored the economy to a feverish state of "health," as the national product rose to \$217 billion in 1950, and in the following year, to the hitherto undreamed of heights of \$325 billion.

War and Depression

The recent history of American capitalism indicates that war is the sole technique for staving off depression available to a government committed in advance to the defense of the status quo. For twelve years (1940-1952), American capitalism has "solved" its major dilemma by this means, because it has no alternative. For twelve years, consciously or not, the American people have enjoyed a "prosperity" based on a perpetual blood-letting. It is scarcely to be wondered at that sophisticated conservatives of both parties, confronted with these realities, have come consciously to adopt a perspective of permanent war economy.

Once this perspective is accepted, certain economic measures become unavoidable. A permanent war economy is necessarily an inflationary economy, because a large

proportion of its commodities (war goods) are not available for purchase by private citizens. Yet purchasing-power (wages to war workers) is abundant. These dollars bid against each other for scarce consumer goods, and prices rise. Therefore, any government which runs a permanent war economy must establish economic controls. High taxes must drain off purchasing power; credit controls must reduce the supply of money; wage and price controls must combat the inflationary spiral; scarce materials must be rationed to manufacturers; vital industries like atomic energy must be taken over directly by government monopoly.

Profound political changes likewise become necessary. Certain measures of population control are inescapable: a nation perpetually on the brink of war must be kept in a mood of acquiescent dread by constant reference to the Enemy Without. An outlet for the aggression thus engendered must be provided through witch-hunts directed against the Enemy Within. Universal Military Training, to indoctrinate the citizen in his new role, is sure to be inaugurated.

"National unity" in the face of external danger must be achieved at all costs. This means, above all, that labor unions must be used, not smashed. Through skillful manipulation of the labor leader, unions become in part instruments of discipline over the labor force, preventing wildcats, and serious stoppages in war industry. Concessions (preferably small) must be made to minority groups to assure their loyalty. A modicum of welfare measures like social security must be continued, in return for the citizen's unquestioning loyalty to the State. Finally, the last vestiges of isolationist sentiment must be buried. To operate this system on a world scale, it is necessary to think politically in world terms.

None of these political-economic changes are speculative or prophetic. The Truman administration has accomplished every one of them *in fact*, with the single exception of UMT. The Republican Party, if it should assume power in 1953, would be obliged to follow the same course. Nowhere is the coercive effect of the permanent war economy on American party politics more apparent than in the struggle within the Republican Party, as it prepared to make its bid for power.

(II) The Republican Accommodation

Toward the end of the first political peep-show in Chicago, when it became apparent that the Taft forces would be defeated, Messrs. George Sokolsky and Westbrook Pegler took to singing the blues in their respective syndicated columns. The theme of their song was the ingratitude of Big Business toward one who had served it so long and faithfully: How, they moaned in chorus, could Wall St. ruthlessly foreclose on the man who had mortgaged his political future to them, by engineering the unpopular Taft-Hartley Act? This is a good question, requiring deeper insight than is possessed by either of the gentlemen who ask it. An adequate understanding of Taft's rejection by Big Business involves a knowledge of the social base of the Taft and Eisenhower groups, their contrasting ideologies,

and the relationship of these ideologies to the permanent war economy.

In a pre-convention issue of *The Nation* (July 5), a former financial writer on the New York Stock Exchange, Barrow Lyons, gives an interesting account of the financial backers of both groups. The Ike camp received checks from the top executives of such firms as Chase National Bank, Philadelphia Fidelity National Bank, IBM, General Electric, GM, Ford Motor Co., Standard Oil, Arabian-American Oil, Gulf Oil, Goodrich Rubber and General Foods.

Taft received donations from men connected with Timken-Roller-Bearings, Sears Roebuck, Tompkins Product, Inland Steel, the McCormick publishing interests, and a host of small firms unfamiliar to the public. Roughly we can say that Taft's social base is composed of big farmers and little businessmen, while Ike's strength comes from large manufacturing and financial interests. This division approximates C. Wright Mill's distinction between the "practical" right, concerned only with short-run profit, and the sophisticated conservative, who looks ahead toward preservation of the system.

With different roots in the social order, it is natural that the ideologies of the two groups should diverge. The Taftites are primarily interested in the domestic market, and are consequently isolationist in sentiment. They are unfriendly to NATO and the UN, and would cut back on foreign aid. They regard European capitalism as expendable in the cold war. Diplomatically, they belong to the dispatch-a-gunboat school, or to its modern equivalent, the dispatch-MacArthur school. Like MacArthur, Taft Republicans oppose UMT, on the ground that it paves the way for further state regimentation.

Eisenhower Republicans are of course "internationalists." As one would expect of Big Business, they see the world, rather than some sector of it, as an object of profit. They are committed to propping up European capitalism, to support of the Marshall Plan, NATO, the UN, and to the passage of UMT. A listing of Ike's advisers indicates his orientation in the foreign policy sphere. Paul Hoffman, former Marshall Plan director, is on the General's advisory staff, as is General Lucius Clay (now president of Continental Can). Also associated with Ike is William H. Draper, of Dillon, Read & Co., erstwhile financial assistant to General Clay's military government in Germany, — now special representative to the Mutual Security Agency and NATO. Another Ike supporter is Phillip Reed, chairman of General Electric, who, together with Draper, is said to have sabotaged the decartelization of German industry.

Differ on Labor Policy

It is simply untrue that Taft and Ike have the same labor policy. It is not mere demagoguery, when at a press conference Eisenhower hints of consulting Walter Reuther on labor questions. His support comes from a group of industrialists with a record of "enlightened" labor relations. These men intend to integrate the business elite with the military and governmental bureaucracies, and invite

the labor leader to join this alliance as a junior partner. The Taft forces, on the other hand, far from fostering this kind of "national unity", are pure and simple union-busters, and under present conditions of union organization, their anti-labor legislation would precipitate a bitter class struggle.

Taft is opposed equally to Big Unions and to Big Government, because both interfere with unrestrained profit-taking. He has traditionally been for low taxes, against "government spending" (welfare), against economic controls of any kind, and against governmental competition with private industry. The Eisenhower group is more resilient in matters of welfare and economic controls. In the words of Ike's campaign manager, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge (*Harpers*, May 1952):

...today, more than at most times, the issues to be settled are a matter of adjusting necessities. . . . To maintain our alliances without straining our resources, to keep a strong defense without raising taxes to crushing levels, to meet the legitimate expectations in the field of social service. . . . this is a task requiring something more than doctrinaire conceptions. (My emphasis, BB).

It should be clear by now that item for item, the Taft ideology is wholly incompatible with a permanent war economy. The Eisenhower forces, on the other hand, are well prepared for the task of administering a garrison state.

The rejection of Taft by Big Business must be interpreted in this light. Taft was flattened by the permanent war economy, though his followers still don't understand what hit them. The decision of the auto industry to support Eisenhower is typical. The domestic market is glutted with new cars. Either the industry makes tanks, or it goes under. Ike's victory is as simple as that.

The task imposed by history on the Republican Party at its 1952 convention was to slough off its traditional, obsolete ideology, and accommodate itself to the exigencies of a permanent war economy. This it accomplished through the victory of the Eisenhower forces. Had the Taftites won, the Party would have made its bid for power as the instrument of a group of wild-eyed Utopian capitalists, espousing a program utterly irrelevant to the current requirements of American capitalism.

(III) The Democratic Accommodation

While the Republicans are merely would-be administrators of a permanent war economy, the Democrats administer it in fact. The Democratic Party exhibits no such dramatic "adjustment to necessities" as occurred at the Republican convention, for the simple reason that the Democratic accommodation to the permanent war economy has been in process for the past twelve years. The evolution from New Deal to Fair Deal represents a shift from welfare to warfare; from WPA to WPB; from temporary economic makeshift to permanent war economy.

Many liberals, in preparing to support the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket, are forced to play little games of self-deception. They pretend, for instance, that the Democratic

Party is still the party of FDR, marching forward with the banner of the common man. The truth is that today New Deal liberalism is an Utopian ideology. Like Taftism, it is a casualty of the permanent war economy.

Nothing illustrates the current irrelevance of old-style liberalism better than the abortive Douglas-for-President movement. Justice Douglas, a Roosevelt appointee to the Supreme Court, is ideologically fixated at the liberal creed of the 1930's. He holds, for instance, the ACLU position on civil liberties. He believes that a democratic foreign policy is possible. These are tenets of the liberal creed to which most liberals still subscribe *in theory*. But no liberal expects the Democratic Party *in power* to act upon these tenets. While most liberals would have welcomed the nomination of Justice Douglas, no liberal took his candidacy seriously. All understood that in the crucial areas of foreign policy and civil liberties, the Douglas position is strictly Utopian.

Today no realistic liberal believes that a democratic foreign policy is possible. The most he hopes for is an *effective* policy of containment. If in the course of being "effective," American foreign policy undertakes the remilitarization (read reNazification) of Germany and Japan; if it props up such totalitarian regimes as those of Chiang, Rhee, or Franco; if, as Nehru has charged, it underwrites European colonialism through NATO; if it participates in a suicidal armaments race; if it conducts strangely interminable truce negotiations in Korea with one hand, while it conducts "Operation Killer" with the other; — these things are simply . . . deplorable. But the reactionary, war-breeding foreign policy of the Democratic Party is not merely a "deplorable mistake." After all, a permanent war economy implies a permanent war.

Abandonment of Civil Liberties

The realistic liberal who prepares to assume power (that is, who rejects Douglas, and accepts Stevenson), must "adjust to necessities" precisely as did the Eisenhower forces. In addition to abandoning any hope of a democratic foreign policy, he must give up obsolete notions about civil liberties. A relentless pursuit of the Enemy Within is forced willy-nilly upon the administrators of a permanent war economy. The party in power is obliged to provide the people with "two-minute hate-sessions," in order to maintain their will to wage war. How else account for the record of the Truman administration in this regard?

How account for the attorney-general's "subversive" list, — the jumping-off point for the current political repression? How account for Truman's instructions to his attorney-general to initiate prosecutions of Communist Party members under the Smith Act? How account for the incredible growth of the American secret police, whose activities have shifted from crime-prevention to political intimidation, all during a Democratic administration? How account for the fact that the most effective member of the Wisconsin-Nevada axis has been not Republican Joe McCarthy, but Democrat Pat McCarran? How account for the vote of *liberal* Congressional Democrats for the Mc-

Carran Subversive Control Act, and for the liberal-sponsored amendment to the Act, which calls for wartime concentration camps for Communists? How account for the Truman-appointed majority of the Supreme Court, which has torn down one judicial bar after another, lest the witch-hunters stumble in their mad chase? A comparison of the record of these Truman appointees with that of Justice Douglas is a clear measure of the coercive effect of the permanent war economy upon the Democratic Party.

If New Deal liberalism is irrelevant in the crucial fields of foreign policy and civil liberties, are there other areas where the paralyzing effects of the permanent war economy is equally apparent? The New Deal position on social services and the Welfare State is a familiar one. It should be perfectly clear that no significant extension of social services is possible within the framework of a permanent war economy. When a crushing burden of armaments weighs down the ship of state, welfare is the first thing to go overboard.

Labor and the Fair Deal

The labor legislation of the New Deal was its proudest accomplishment. The Fair Deal, however, is no longer free to legislate in the tradition of the Wagner Act. For one thing, a cold war requires a wage-freeze, as an anti-inflationary measure. The Democratic Party thus finds itself in the position of imposing an artificial limitation on the bargaining power of the unions, — an antagonism revealed when labor members temporarily withdrew from the Wage Stabilization Board. With a Congress which simultaneously shoots price controls full of holes, a wage-freeze simply dips into the pocket of the workingman. Perhaps more important, in a permanent war economy the executive must have the power to break strikes which "threaten the national security," — that is, all successful large-scale walk-outs. Campaign rhetoric to the contrary notwithstanding, it is unlikely that this key provision of the Taft-Hartley Act will ever be repealed within the context of a permanent war economy.

If the Republicans have their Utopian capitalists, the Democrats have their Utopian liberals. Each group of Utopians may loyally support the party ticket, but there is no chance that either can thereby realize its goals. The permanent war economy has made a joke of the "two-party system." It has narrowed the area of free choice confronting the custodians of American capitalism to minor differences over administrative detail. The over-all policy is determined in advance, and the broad outlines of our future are clear.

The choice facing the American people this November is consequently an extremely narrow one. No *alternative* is offered by the major parties to the bi-partisan foreign policy of peace through mutual fright, nor to the equally bi-partisan commitment to a permanent war economy. Our choice is reduced to which of two political machines will be chosen to administer the emerging garrison state.

(IV) The Alternative: A Socialist Protest Vote

At present writing, it seems likely that Governor Stevenson will achieve a campus popularity unprecedented for

presidential candidates in recent years. Unlike the ex-haberdasher, he can quote Shakespeare without affectation, and is therefore "one of us." The source of Stevenson's popularity among intellectuals is the conviction that, being literate, he will somehow "make the right choices" in office. The case of Woodrow Wilson should have taught us that literacy is not enough. The role coerces the individual, — especially in a situation where the range of choice has been drastically reduced by the permanent war economy.

His running mate, Senator Sparkman, should receive short shrift from *Anvil* readers. Wrong on civil rights; wrong on labor issues (he voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, and its predecessor, the Smith-Connely Act, and against the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938); wrong on UMT; wrong on civil liberties (he voted for the McCarran Act); — he is above all a symbol of the abject capitulation by the Democratic Party to its white supremacist wing. This, then, is the slate with which the Democratic Party confronts the student liberal

An Inch and a Mile

We are not arguing to be sure, that there is literally no difference between the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket and that of the Republican Party. One major party is frankly a businessman's party, while the other must make at least occasional concessions to labor. But we do maintain that on the decisive, over-riding political questions of our time, — on the issues involving the permanent war economy, — the political distance between Stevenson and Eisenhower is an inch, while the distance between Stevenson and an anti-war position is a mile. We urge our readers not to leap over the mile, for the sake of the inch. A vote for the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket is a vote for a permanent war economy. Ultimately, it is a vote for war.

What, then, is the alternative? Is a meaningful protest vote available? *Anvil* readers cannot of course consider the Progressive Party as an acceptable alternative. A vote for the Progressive Party is a sucker vote, not a protest vote. Such a vote aids only the native hucksters of Russian totalitarianism. The Progressive Party, for its own reasons, opposes the main drift in American society, while it whitewashes the Russian prototype of the garrison state.

It is nevertheless possible to register a symbolic protest against the drift toward war on election day, by voting for a socialist party which stands for a clear break with the main drift, — a party willing to undertake radical social change, and to attack the permanent war economy at its roots. A socialist protest vote will not stop the main drift. Only a labor party, and consequent developments which the advent of such a party would make possible, can do that. Meanwhile, a student who is serious in his anti-war views cannot abandon these views one day, and re-assume them the next. He is under obligation to translate his anti-war position into a meaningful act on election day. His only course is to protest the reactionary politics of the two major parties by voting for a socialist candidate.

BOB BONE

American Labor's Political Future

Can Labor Afford to Remain in the Democratic Party?

JACK KROLL, director of CIO's Political Action Committee, and Joseph Keenan, then director of AFL's League for Political Education were members of that select minority which consistently predicted President Truman's victory in 1948. The basis of their faith, as nearly as I can determine, was their intimate knowledge of labor's increased activity in the politics of ward and precinct. Informed observers in labor's ranks tell me that four times as many persons worked at getting out the vote in the 1948 elections as did in former elections in which CIO participated directly.

This grass-roots approach to politics, this increased emphasis on political action in the practical sense, contrasts markedly with Labor's efforts in earlier campaigns when propaganda and pamphleteering received more emphasis than grass-roots organization. The reasons are speculative, but this may be due to the nature of the men who directed the 1948 campaign. Both Messrs. Kroll and Keenan are practical trade unionists with years of organizing experience, men who by nature and experience are more interested in the workers on the organizational and political firing line than in the layouts of pamphlets.

This was not always so. How clearly I recall the early days of PAC when Sidney Hillman was surrounded by college-trained men, the intellectuals on his staff, who thought that elections were won by the manipulations of mass media. Many times, as a member of PAC's editorial committee, I spent hours denying the educational benefit of the more sophisticated *New Yorker* type cartoons in workers' pamphlets, only to lose the argument and later to discover the undistributed pamphlets behind some union office door. The change to a predominant emphasis on political organization under Kroll and Keenan, however, does not mean that education was neglected in the 1948 campaign. It only means that practical trade unionists put leg work before art work, nose-counting before pamphlet distribution.

Labor's efforts in the last weeks of the 1948 campaign are even more amazing when we recall that the top men among its leaders were not particularly enthusiastic about President Truman's candidacy. To most of them F.D.R. was still the President and Harry Truman was an unreliable weakling who promised much and delivered little — a dangerous unpredictable who blew up when the railroad workers went on strike. Hence the consistent efforts on the part of top labor leaders, and many Roosevelt liberals in the Americans for Democratic Action, to draft General Eisenhower to lead the disillusioned and disorganized Democrats to victory.

At this point it must also be remembered that the labor leaders of America, particularly those in the CIO, were

conditioned by twelve years of F.D.R. They grew up with and were nurtured by the Wagner Act. Because of this relationship and this nurturing they developed a Great White Father complex. General Eisenhower, they believed, would develop into another Great White Father. He was born on their side of the tracks and could thus be trusted. They believed too, that Eisenhower's popularity would sweep in a Democratic Congress and the General, elected with labor's help, would understand the necessity of dealing with those lesser leaders who command the legions of American labor. Furthermore, many a leader, proud of his contacts with the White House during the years of the Roosevelts, looked forward to the continuation of similar contacts. Face-to-face settlement of issues by men who had power was a pattern they understood and lived by. Finally, it must never be forgotten that labor leaders who fought long and hard for their places of power in their unions naturally respected men in other fields who excelled them in the art of leadership. Harry Truman, they were quite convinced, was not in the same league with F.D.R. and Ike Eisenhower as a leader. Consequently, General Eisenhower's refusal to run was a blow to their hopes, and Truman's nomination was accepted without much enthusiasm.

As a result, labor strategy was very simple in the early summer of 1948; put all possible emphasis on the Senatorial and Congressional elections; control inflation; wipe out the stigma of Taft-Hartley; and if Harry Truman is accidentally elected as a by-product of labor's political efforts, everyone in its ranks will be most agreeably surprised. Only later, when the crowds coming out to hear Harry Truman as he toured the country grew larger, did their attitude change and their support for Truman increase. However, to the everlasting credit of labor politicians, they sensed the swing in public opinion before many Democratic machine men caught on.

Nevertheless, convinced that Mr. Dewey was going to be elected, more than one caucus and bull session took place in the ranks of labor, up to the very day of the election, on how to get along with Mr. Dewey and the Republicans; and a few, including Mr. McFettridge, felt so sure of a Dewey victory that they decided to climb on his bandwagon.

Lessons from 1948 Campaign

Fortunately for labor, and equally fortunately, perhaps, for the American people as a whole, this emphasis on Senatorial and Congressional elections stimulated local political activity and made victory increasingly dependent on the sergeants, the corporals, and not a few of the privates in labor's ranks. This is a lesson it is devoutly to be hoped will be long remembered by those in the positions

of power in the echelons of labor. If it is understood, the next step in labor's political evolution will witness the same or greater activity in state and local elections as was developed in national ones; for victory at the polls will in the future, it seems to me, be increasingly dependent not only on the independent decisions of the American voters, men and women who listen to the arguments on controversial issues and then make up their own minds on how to vote, but also on the political amateurs who are determined to take a hand in local government. This means that if labor wants to win in future elections, it must develop both a program and an organization; and above all it must understand that in America the people really are sovereign.

If labor leaders analyze the Truman victory they can learn much — they can learn, for example, that Harry Truman's victory was a victory for the little shots who got out the vote, a defeat for the big shots who would rather deal with the leader at the top level of the power structure than trust the people at the bottom, and an indication that Lincoln was right when he wrote to his son Dick, "Keep close to the people, they will not lead you astray."

Truman's election meant the end of any immediate formation of a labor party, be it the Henry Wallace, the Walter Reuther, or even the innocent William Green variety. It gave labor time to bring about the unity in its ranks without which independent political action would be futile. Today even a united labor movement cannot win national or state elections without an alliance with one or more other groups in our body politic. Furthermore, the Truman victory, in spite of the attrition from the left and right, from the Wallaceites, Dixiecrats, etc., meant a resurgence of the Democratic Party. Finally it meant temporarily, at least, the incorporation in the Democratic Party of a considerable part of those liberal elements among the white-collar groups and farmers who would not feel at home in a labor party. Recognizing these facts, the political pragmatists at both the CIO and AFL conventions in 1948 vetoed a labor party for the present.

The relation between organized labor and the Democratic machine varies from state to state, from city to city, and from organization to organization. Among the welter of these relationships, however, two rather consistent and distinct patterns stand out. In the first, labor, the most powerful group in the community in numbers and financial resources, enters into a partnership with the Democratic machine leaders with the understanding that that part of the party program of direct interest to labor, and those appointments which concerns it, will receive favorable consideration after the election. This is a horsetrading relationship, one which rests on the philosophy of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours." In the second, labor has greater if not more direct influence. Its spokesmen have considerable voice in the formulation of pre-election platforms, some choice in the selection of candidates, and occasional persons who are an integral part of the political machine on the ward and precinct level. This sort of relationship might lead to an integration of labor and the Democratic machine.

The future of the Democratic Party and of labor's relation to it rests in the perfection of this relationship. Labor, in the years ahead, will have to decide how far it intends to go in taking over, or in being taken over, by the Democratic Party, if it does not want to continue in a position where it does the legwork and picks up the checks. To be specific, labor must find its place in state and city machines, be a part of every state and city central committee, every ward and precinct organization, and particularly must have a choice in the selection of candidates who run for office.

Labor and the Democratic Party

Otherwise, labor will be thought by the American public to have political power and will be judged as if it had, while actually the fundamental political decisions arrived at before election day, which are of the greatest significance, will be in the hands of the machine politicians. If that happens it is even possible that men and women in labor's ranks might lose their enthusiasm for dollar-raising and doorbell-ringing — that is, if they find the same old gang down at the courthouse calling the tune.

Here in Illinois — to be exact in the second Congressional District — I heard some very vigorous gripes from the steel workers who were asked to beat the bushes for votes for a candidate they had no voice in choosing. Other steel workers, more sophisticated than their brethren, told me — and perhaps rightfully so — that the machine Democrats of Chicago felt the chance for victory was hopeless in 1948, and therefore refused in the early part of the campaign to carry the lead in dollars and doorbell-ringing. A few even insisted that one of the contributing factors in the nomination of Paul Douglas, Adlai Stevenson, and John Boyle was the conviction on the part of the machine that they had no chance to win anyway. "Let's kill the radicals off," the machine said to themselves, "by letting them run when they have no chance of victory."

This attitude of the machine bosses is dangerous to labor's interests. It can best be overcome, I believe by a determined effort on the part of labor to develop able men for local offices on every level. School boards, city councils, and state legislatures are also important in the American political scene; and it is in such offices that future Congressmen and Senators serve their apprenticeships. Organized labor, in a word, should not neglect local elections, for local politics is the training school for national leadership.

There is little new in labor's program. It is based on the New Deal; and nothing in it attacks the fundamental structure of our economy, with the possible exception of the President's statement that the government might have to build steel plants if Big Steel continued to refuse to expand production. Very little in the program indicates any long-range economic thinking, either on the part of labor economists or of the economists who are advisers to the President. Nor is this unexpected. Today our economy is riding high: a 320 billion dollar national product, a 280 billion dollar income in wages and salaries, and 61 mil-

lion employed. The little softening up which has taken place in textiles, shoes, and certain items of consumer durables has not materially affected the thinking of top labor leaders. Furthermore, steel and auto, the most powerful unions in the policy formation of CIO, are enjoying maximum prosperity in their respective industries. Labor, as a part of the Truman administration, enjoys with the Administration the fruits of a high-level full-employment economy; and labor, like the Administration, wants to maintain the economy at its present level. Consequently, Mr. Murray, like Mr. Truman, assures the American businessman of his continued support of free enterprise.

War Economy

However, everyone in labor's ranks is not oblivious to the dilemma of the present moment. A few understand that our economy is geared to 45 billion dollars of direct defense expenditures; and more than once those worried ones ask themselves, "What would happen to our economy if Uncle Joe should wage a peace offensive and America no longer had an international crisis to justify its subsidized exports and rearmament program?"

There are many men in the labor movement who recall that even the best efforts of the New Deal did not wipe out unemployment, and that as late as 1938-39 nine million Americans were without jobs. They also know that the economic stimulus of the coming war was the only source of rescue for those idle Americans who could not find employment in peacetime. Lend-lease was the first stimulus; it was followed by the war; the war by UNRRA, and UNRRA by ECA; and then we were told we must rearm Western Europe.

Yes, indeed, the devil has led the leaders of labor to the top of a high mountain and has told them, "All these things — prosperity, full employment, high wages, steady per capita — are yours, if you do not question what makes them possible!"

The last election, as was said before, witnessed the repudiation of both the Dixiecrats and the Wallaceites. The victory in November, 1948, which labor believes it was responsible for, also saw the political triumph within CIO's ranks of the anti-Communists. I rejoice in their triumph; but I am not one who believes that a labor movement or a government can consistently receive its impetus from uniting against someone or something. Negations, it seems to me, are not the best of historical stimuli. Nor is it enough to accept the shot in the economic arm which defense expenditures give, if labor would serve this hour in history. It is a labor responsibility to do that hard thinking necessary to formulate an economic program which will give the American people the continuing economic stability which we now enjoy from defense expenditures. Today labor must try to project the position it will be in after its program of social legislation is enacted into law. Exactly what will it do, what will it offer its members, what will

be its program for labor and the American public, should deflation and unemployment come? These are the questions which need immediate attention.

National Prosperity Budget

The election of Truman did not provide the economic program the country needs in the long run. It is my conviction that we must implement the Full Employment Act of 1946, must plan for peace by developing a "national prosperity budget" in order to draw up a broad appraisal of the general condition of our whole economy and its outlook for the future. It would set forth, for a period of a few years ahead, the national output that this level of employment could generate, and break this down into broad categories such as agricultural output, steel output, foreign trade, etc. It would apply the tools of economic analysis to the task of defining the kind of balance among the various lines of production and consumption which would be most likely to maintain an expanding economy in equilibrium. It would thus furnish better guides to the voluntary agencies in our economic system than any which they now possess.

"This national prosperity budget would not have the aspects of a national plan, would not be compulsory, would not be thrust upon anyone; but it would be an attempt to do in peacetime what we do in wartime — an attempt to plan for the national interests, an attempt to anticipate the national need."

Labor should take the initiative in setting up a commission of the best economists in labor, liberal business, and universities; a completely free commission which would meet for the purpose of thinking through the economic problems of contemporary America, developing a program and supplying the labor propagandists with the body of economic content they have so long lacked. Such a commission, naturally, should be beyond influence by immediate political considerations. Its purpose could best be served by long-range considerations.

Lest I be misunderstood, at this point I wish to make it very clear that this argument, for peacetime planning, this escape from an economy tied to war, is not an argument for unilateral disarmament and weakening of America. It is, on the other hand, an argument for the creation of a radical, dynamic program for economic stability which would take the play away from our Communist brethren in the economic field. I am tired of looking under the bed for Communists — in the future, I would like to see a labor movement so democratically aggressive that the Communists would seem conservative by contrast.

And this insistence on aggressive democracy must carry over into the international sphere. It is not enough for organized labor to support E.C.A., reciprocal trade, and other efforts for economic recovery as outlined by the President.

Organized labor has a responsibility to insist, in season and out of season, that reaction and militarism are not America's allies. Just because the Communists take a moral position against exploitation and imperialism does not mean we should take an opposite one. It is up to us to beat the

Communists to the punch in every country seeking its freedom. Russia and America are not all the world.

Lest my labor and liberal friends misunderstand me, permit me to reassure them that I have not forgotten labor's magnificent emphasis on the relation between economic recovery and political freedom in Europe and elsewhere. However the World Federation of Trade Unions is — for all practical purposes — dead. The hatred for Communism and totalitarianism is intense; the temptation to war is constant; and for Americans who were not bombed and who were fully employed the memories of war are not too unpleasant.

This, then, is a time for democratic advance in economic democracy, a time when we dare not flout the wills of people who believe capitalism no longer meets their needs, who want to socialize their resources and industries and who sometimes fear capitalistic America as much as Communistic Russia. Nor do we dare forget that the peoples of the world, the workers, never benefit from war. They only fight and die.

Toward a Labor Party

Once labor arrives at the decision that our democratic future, and the world's, is dependent upon planning and economic decisions based on the most valid information, we automatically bring up the most complicated question which American labor must face. The question is this: can labor continue to insist on power without responsibility? Dare labor go on as a pressure group even though that pressure is exercised through the Democratic Party? Or should American labor united with the American liberals, form an independent political party like the British Labour Party?

Whenever I think about this question I conclude it would be good for labor to have a political vehicle to implement its program. Then, if it comes to power it will also come to judgment, and the American public will have a chance to weigh and accept or repudiate its program. Now, it has no such chance. Within the amalgam which is the Democratic Party, labor can always blame the Southerners or the farmers for its failures. Reasoning thus, I accept the necessity for an independent labor party. At the same time, I am not without doubt, because I have experienced European parties organized along class lines. Thinking about the European experience makes me prefer the American two-party system which reconciles its conflicting parts.

Perhaps, then, all that I am asking for as I conclude is that those leaders who are responsible for labor's future should face the decisions which are theirs before they are forced into decisions by economic and political necessity. This is a lot to expect, I know, for labor leaders are on the whole activists, men who meet problems as they arise, not philosophers. And since this is true, perhaps the economists and educators in the unions and other circles must be willing to supply the facts and philosophy, as they did in Britain through the Fabians.

Finally, as a person who has lived 12 years in the labor movement, 6 in the AFL, 6 in the CIO, I always come

to the same conclusion when I think about labor's political future. Labor needs, in the years that lie ahead, men who understand the world in which they live and of which they are a part. These men must understand our democratic heritage, the contribution of labor to that heritage, and above all they must have an understanding of the ideologies which are everywhere struggling for the souls of men. Out of this study must come men with a democratic temper, a personal maturity, and a philosophy of history. These individuals must encourage the development within the labor movement of an open caucus and a two-party system, — putting an end to the charge of factionalism against anyone who dares oppose the persons in power. Likewise, to further democracy in its ranks labor needs to have more rotation in office, new blood in positions of responsibility. In other words, labor must support the same things in labor politics which it demands in political democracy. Labor leaders whose power rests on a one-party system or power pattern are not enough. The making of decisions must be dispersed in union politics as in party politics, and in turn must rest upon an educated and informed membership.

Labor's political future, therefore, demands that labor get over its fear of democracy, look around and clean its own house before demanding power over others. All around us there are evidences that the day of the political boss and the regimented voter are waning. The American people are beginning to make their decisions on the basis of issues. Labor holds the key to this evolution. If it contributes to the education, not indoctrination, of its rank and file, the future holds great promise. If on the other hand, it insists on power without democratic decision, on leadership without criticism, we can expect only a loss of democratic institutions to this new elite. Labor's political future is of interest not only to those in the ranks of labor: its development concerns us all.

KERMIT EBY

Kermit Eby has been active in the U.S. labor movement for many years. He organized the first teachers' union in Ann Arbor, Mich., and later helped to organize the auto workers in that state. From 1937-42 he was Executive Secretary of the Chicago Teachers' Union. From 1943-48 he was Asst. Director, and then Director, of Education and Research for national CIO. Since 1948 he has been on the faculty of the University of Chicago.

What do you think of ANVIL?

Your letters of criticism or support are welcome. They will help us to publish a more effective magazine.

Please note whether part or all of your letters may be published in Anvil.

Hemingway and the Concept of Virility

A Critical Examination of the Author's Major Novels

IF IT WERE POSSIBLE to sum up all themes in Hemingway's fiction, the total would probably result in the word "virility." The lonely courage which is the great virtue of his heroes, is part of it. The sexual potency and sometimes the impotence of his characters is directly related to it. The background of war and death, almost invariable for his fiction, is the testing ground for it. One might, at times, find it obsessional, physically intrusive in all of his situations were it not for the fact that in each instance, even where it is casually mentioned, it is never superfluous, but always serves some function of characterization, or development.

Hemingway's Anti-intellectualism

The very attitude, one might even call it "pose" which Hemingway adopts with critics might be said to stem from the concept that killing, fighting, feeling are all pure and good; but that thought, analysis and criticism are false, distorting, unreal attitudes toward life. When Hemingway is told by one of his admirers that he is to be the subject of an article, he invariably replies that he is not responsible for any inaccuracies or legendary accomplishments which might be attributed to him, that he would be delighted if the statements about his writing or his life should eventually be disproved. At times, he comments about criticism of his work, using words appropriate for describing a boxing match or a baseball game as if he were showing his disdain for the language of the intellectual and contempt for any enterprise which is "explanatory."

Such an attitude is hardly new. Contended by philosophers, discussed by poets and silently debated by men for centuries, it is best expressed, perhaps, by Faust in the early scenes of Goethe's dramatic poem and given there a romantic stress which is quite appropriate for discussing a romantic such as Hemingway:

I drag my life through learned bric-a-brac.
And shall I here discover what I lack,
And learn, by reading countless volumes through,
That mortals mostly live on misery's rack, I aspire.
To rise to spheres of pure activity.

'Tis writ, 'In the beginning was the Word.'
The Word I cannot set supremely high:
A new translation I will try.

I write, 'In the beginning was the Deed.'

(Faust Act I, Scenes 1 and 2)

The translation emasculates, somewhat, the vigor of the German; but the conclusion is clear. Pure activity, the deed, is everything. The word is but a pale reflection in a tarnished mirror. Hemingway has carried this to the point of feeling that, in fiction, it is the hero's deed which must evoke feelings of pity, of terror, and of tragedy. To com-

ment on the emotion is to destroy it. To state barely simply, even curtly is the art of control, the discipline in writing. To the extent that the reader identifies with the situation and with the characters, he will *feel* the emotion implied by bare detail, and felt by the writer. But first, he must make an effort to understand the situation, just as the writer must strive to choose that sequence of events which best dramatizes the emotion, and just as the reader must, himself, strive to understand events when they occur in his own life. Perhaps understanding is an impossibility; but then so is comment, analysis, and explanation. Virility is, among other things, the capacity for *action*.

The Word and the Deed

If we take one or two paragraphs from some of Hemingway's stories we will find a richer source, and a greater number of implications in his point of view, than we could possibly get from mere restatement:

The first is from *The Snows of Kilimanjaro*, in which the dying man has been trying to destroy his wife's love for him in order to save her the pain of his death, and has failed.

"You don't have to destroy me. Do you? I'm only a middle-aged woman who loves you and wants to do what you want to do. I've been destroyed two or three times already. You wouldn't want to destroy me again would you?"

"I'd like to destroy you a few times in bed," he said.

"Yes. That's the good destruction. That's the way we're made to be destroyed. The plane will be here tomorrow."

"... Then, in town, they will fix up your leg and then we will have some good destruction. Not that dreadful talking kind."

In the same story, several paragraphs further on, the dying man recalls an episode of death during the war, which he had always wanted to write about:

That was the day he'd first seen dead men wearing white ballet skirts and upturned shoes with pompoms on them. The Turks had come steadily and lumpily and he had seen the skirted men running and the officers shooting into them and running then themselves and he and the British observer had run too until his lungs ached and his mouth was full of the taste of pennies and they stopped behind some rocks and there were the Turks coming as lumpily as ever. Later he had seen the things that he could never think of and later still he had seen much worse. So when he got back to Paris that time he could not talk about it or stand to have it mentioned. And there in the cafe as he passed was that American poet with a pile of saucers in front of him and a stupid look on his potato face talking about the Dada movement with a Roumanian who said his name was Tristan Tzara, who always wore a monocle and had a headache.

Here, then, is the simple juxtaposition: in the first scene the woman tells us that destruction of the "talking kind" is "dreadful" but that sex is the "good destruction." In the

other scene, the dying man, reminiscing, thinks about the soldiers in skirts and pom-pom shoes, dying, running . . . (in action). He tells us in the next sentence that he saw worse things, things he couldn't stand to have mentioned (talked about) and then in the very next sentence that he recalled an expatriate poet from America talking about the Dada movement in a cafe with a Roumanian who called himself Tristan Tzara, "always wore a monocle and had a headache"

The irony in this comparison between "talking" and "acting" is obvious. But why is the poet talking about the "Dada movement" and why does the Roumanian wear a monocle? Tristan Tzara was evidently one of the leaders of the Dada movement which was the most extreme and ridiculous theory of art which Hemingway could think of at the moment and the monocle and the constant headache, probably a consequence of the monocle, seemed to Hemingway very false. Was the author trying to tell us that death is "real" but that the expatriate poet is as phony as the theory he is talking about and the man whom he is talking with? Perhaps such an interpretation implies too much from a simple contrast. But more probably, given Hemingway's general notions, that is exactly what he wished to imply.

Implications of the Theory

The full implication of Hemingway's theory, is not merely that life and death are real, but that to be alive, virile, to have courage is to invite destruction. Nowhere is this quite so clearly or directly stated as in *A Farewell To Arms*:

If people bring so much courage to this world the world has to kill them or break them, so of course it kills them. The world breaks everyone and afterwards many are strong at the broken places. But those that will not break it kills. It kills the very good and the very brave and the very gentle impartially. If you are none of these you can be sure it will kill you too but there will be no special hurry. (p. 267).

This, then, adds another element to the Hemingway hero. He is, in some way, already partly broken. The courageous men, who become the main focus of his novels, are "strong at the broken places"; the rest are merely broken and many have been killed or are being killed in the life process with "no special hurry" because they had no real courage from the beginning.

Who, then, are "the very good, the very brave and the very gentle"? They are the ones who have managed, somehow to salvage something out of their defeat in the practical world. And this is perhaps, the root of Hemingway's fundamental interest in the circumstances of war, revolution, bullfighting, hunting and all the other situations in which death is the ever-present possibility for his heroes. "They are not defeated except upon their own terms; some of them have courted defeat; certainly they have maintained even in the practical defeat, an ideal of themselves, formulated or unformulated, by which they have lived." (Brooks and Warren)

Robert Louis Stevenson described this code in even better terms ". . . an ideal of decency, to which (one)

would rise if it were possible; a limit of shame, below which, if it be possible, he will not stoop . . .

"It matters not where we look; under what climate we observe him, in what stage of society, in what depth of ignorance, burthened with what erroneous morality; by campfires in Assiniboia, the snow powdering his shoulders, the wind plucking his blanket, as he sits, passing the ceremonial calumet and uttering his grave opinions like a Roman senator; in ships at sea, a man inured to hardship and vile pleasures, his brightest hope a fiddle in a tavern and a bedizened trull who sells herself to rob him, and he for all that simple, innocent, cheerful, kindly like a child, constant to toil, brave to drown for others; . . . in the brothel, the discard of society, living mainly on strong drink, fed with affronts, a fool, a thief, the comrade of thieves, and even here keeping the point of honor and the touch of pity, often repaying the world's scorn with service, often standing firm upon a scruple, and at a certain cost, rejecting riches."

The Defeated Romantic

This concept that nobility may exist among the defeated has been a characteristic of romantic heroes from *Don Quixote* to *Cyrano*. The American tradition, however, has been strongly dusted over, since the civil war, with the glorification of success, with a strong positivism and its allied emotions, sometimes vulgarized, but occasionally put with great delicacy. Only from the defeated south, and from some of the great tragic writers, such as Fitzgerald, Anderson, and Willa Cather have we had any survival of the true romanticism of defeat carried off by the aristocratic spirit. Some of the left-wing writers and some writers in the Jewish tradition have saved it for us intact from the tragic defeats of their ancestors. But otherwise it has been generally besmirched by the great American need for victory at all costs.

That it should have survived in Stevenson is not too surprising. Its triumphant return to American fiction in the works of Hemingway, however, was a token of the times. Hemingway may never have read Stevenson. The spirit of the defeated romantic does not need literary lessons to survive, however. It grows readily upon the fertile soil of any success bought at the expense of the spirit. The triumph of American industrialism was purchased at just such a price. What better words are available to describe the Hemingway hero than ". . . simple, innocent . . . kindly like a child . . . brave to drown, for others . . . living mainly on strong drink . . . a thief, the comrade of thieves, and even here keeping the point of honor and the touch of pity. . . often standing firm upon a scruple, and at a certain cost, rejecting riches; — everywhere some virtue cherished or affected . . .", the words of Stevenson's essay?

The Sun Also Rises

The first significant novel by Hemingway takes up the theme of the defeated hero, courageous, living mainly on strong drink, keeping the point of honor and the touch of pity etc. and adds to it the concept that a man's virility is the cornerstone of his ability to be all the other things.

For the irony of the theme, the hero is physically impotent and salvages his virility by his courageous attempt to cope with his impotence. The novel is *The Sun Also Rises*, published in 1926.

For added effect, we are treated to an associate of the hero who is physically intact, but, since, he violates the Hemingway code continuously, is in reality quite impotent and ineffectual in spirit. His name is Robert Cohn. He is Jewish, a graduate of Princeton, a writer and naturally a man who thinks of himself as an intellectual. His defect, consistently enough, is that he cannot suffer defeat, pain and the spectacle of death in controlled silence, but feels impelled to talk about it all the time. No greater sin could any man commit, than this one. He relates his emotions at great length. He will not admit his failure with Lady Ashley, whom he loves. And his love is itself abject and not proud. Unlike, Jake, the impotent hero, Cohn is unable to submerge his feelings in drinking sport, or any real form of action. Even his skill as a boxer is analyzed away as a defence mechanism. When Lady Ashley states that Cohn is "not one of us" she merely states what Jake and Hemingway already feel.

But Lady Ashley is herself one of the "impotent" in the sense that she cannot love. She is frightfully in love with Jake, but there are moments when he suspects that it is merely because she cannot have him. During the course of the novel she falls in love with a bullfighter, a young boy called Romero who is pure, courageous and is able to offer her a genuine sexuality. He wants very much to marry her and for a time her feeling changes her. But she realizes, after a brief time, that she cannot really change and returns to live with Mike, an ineffectual, incomplete man and a drunkard. "He's so damned nice and he's so awful. He's my sort of thing," she says. She retains, however, the nobility for which Hemingway's characters are noted because, when she realizes how unable she is to give anything to Romero, she gives him up.

While it is one of Hemingway's more skillful novels, *The Sun Also Rises*, falls short of being tragic and is really quite depressing in its total impact.

Hero Politically Naïve

A Farewell To Arms which appeared in 1929 comes much closer to being a simple and rather beautiful tragedy. It is Hemingway's first long piece of fiction to reveal the element of human integrity amid the chaos of war. The following passage is quoted from an episode which takes place on the Italian front while the army is awaiting an Austrian barrage. Lieutenant Henry, the hero, is speaking:

"I believe we should get the war over," I said. "It would not finish it if one side stopped fighting. It would only be worse if we stopped fighting."

"It could not be worse," Passini said respectfully. "There is nothing worse than war."

"Defeat is worse."

"I do not believe it," Passini said still respectfully. "What is defeat? You go home."

"They come after you. They take your home. They take your sisters."

"I don't believe it," Passini said. "They can't do that to everybody. Let everybody defend his home. . . ."

"I know it is bad but we must finish it."

"It doesn't finish. There is no finish to a war."

"Yes there is."

Passini shook his head.

"War is not won by victory. . . . We think. We read. We are not peasants. We are mechanics. But even the peasants know better than to believe in a war. Everybody hates this war."

"There is a class that controls a country that is stupid and does not realize anything and never can. That is why we have this war."

* *

"We must shut up," said Manera, "We talk too much even for the Tenente."

"He likes it," said Passini. "We will convert him."

"But now we will shut up," Manera said.

"Do we eat yet Tenente?"

Perhaps the first thing which is clear from reading this passage is that the point of view of the Lieutenant is politically naive and that the Italians sense it. They sense it enough to believe that their point of view is stronger and that they can convert the American Lieutenant. Perhaps they feel that his argument lacks subtlety. He wants merely to get the war over with. The war seems to have no meaning for him in terms of "democracy" or any of the other slogans which his own country later used when it went to war. Face to face with the more complex sense of politics of the Italian mechanics, Lieutenant Henry is, as Stevenson says, ". . . simple, innocent . . . like a child . . ." In a sense, he exemplifies the traditional American isolation from the concern of the European worker and peasant with radical politics. He has not been "initiated," as have the Europeans since their youth, into the complexity of anti-war socialism.

Yet he is able to find a certain kind of rapport with the soldiers who serve under him. If it is not because of political agreement, we are justified in looking for some other motive. Upon closer examination, the reader will discover that both the American and the Italians live by a code. It is not exactly the same code; but it involves the same elements, the ones previously mentioned of personal honesty, courage and a private or social discipline.

Because of his private discipline, then, Lieutenant Henry is a virile man and his love affair with Miss Barkley is sexually fulfilling and, in the end, tragic but not hopeless as is the love affair in the previous novel.

His next novel states the case more definitely. Using Donne's words for his dedication and his title, the novel tells us: "No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main . . . any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind: and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee." *For Whom The Bell Tolls*, published in 1940, is the logical and artistic culmination of Hemingway's attempt to define the virile hero.

If one can overcome an incipient distaste at the physical signs of the hero's manliness, which are given in great detail even to noting each moment when a drop of sweat falls from his armpit, the novel can be a rewarding study of the romantic spirit.

Anselmo, the older, more experienced version of the virile hero, first states the theme in his quarrel with Pablo:

"Now we come for something of consummate importance and thee, with thy dwelling place to be undisturbed, puts thy foxhole before the interests of humanity."

Notice how the medieval English forms "thee" and "thou" translate the Spanish better and also serve to carry the spirit of Donne's "The bell . . . tolls for thee."

Pablo, the older, broken man, who is not strong in the broken places, and Pilar, the woman of towering strength, the confidante, the protector of courageous men and of young women, are among the better Hemingway characterizations. As always this is very simply put:

"Que va, God and the Virgin," (Pilar rebukes Pablo) "Is that any way to talk?"

"I am afraid to die, Pilar," he said. "Tengo miedo de morir. Dost thou understand?"

Pilar is herself given the function of carrying Hemingway's romantic concept of sensuality and beauty. Her recital of the bullfights and her toreador lover in Valencia, her listing of the pavilions in the sand, the parties, the paella, the eels, the white wine, the beer sweating in its coldness in pitchers, is one of the memorable passages in the novel. It is also a remarkable tribute to Hemingway's love for Spain.

In part it is the characterization of Anselmo, Pablo, Pilar, and the Spanish peasants and fighters with all of their simplicity and complexity, and the remarkable scenes of the Spanish villages and cities in war and peace, of the food, the drink, the landscape, the traditions of love, the religion, the fear, which make this novel one of Hemingway's unsurpassed efforts. That and the ethics of the sexual act, stated by Pilar, reiterated sweetly and timidly by Maria, and practised in all his quiet strength by Robert Jordan. But the personalities of the two young lovers are again too simply drawn and the novel quietly suffers from this weakness, so that as a love affair, pure and simple, without the tapestry of the Spanish scene to enrich it, the relationship between Maria and Roberto might not be superior to that of Lieutenant Henry and his English nurse.

With his latest piece of fiction, however, Hemingway has reasserted some of his previous power. *The Old Man And The Sea*, which has very recently appeared, is really a novellette and its structure, similar in brevity and intensity to a very long short story such as Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, allows the writer to state the most elementary of themes in one dramatic episode of exactly appropriate length. Hemingway's favorite character is here once again. ". . . an old man who fished alone in a skiff in the Gulf Stream and he had gone eighty-four days now without taking a fish."

Here is another Anselmo, full of courage, though old, and full of faith in the sea, the fish, and the honor and integrity of sport. On the eighty-fifth day, he catches a marlin eighteen feet long from nose to tail. With only a tiny skiff and none of the equipment used by deep sea fishermen except a line and his back upon which

he winds the line to hold the fish, he battles the marlin for several days and nights and succeeds in pulling him in and killing him, only to fight a running battle with the sharks when he is pulling the carcass in and to have the sharks eat the entire fifteen hundred pounds of fish away before he succeeds in getting to shore.

Here is defeat on a grand scale. The entire energy and ebbing strength of the old man is pitted against a worthy opponent, for the eighteen foot fish here has all the courage and beauty of a fighting bull from one of Hemingway's previous stories. But the old man survives his defeat and the pathos of it is seen only in the crying of a young boy.

Hemingway's Style

Together with William Faulkner, Hemingway received his early impetus toward fiction from Sherwood Anderson. Very early in their careers, however, both men began to experiment, and fruitfully so, with the prose fiction tradition. Faulkner moved toward a thickly textured prose which creates mood and atmosphere by the use of layer upon layer of feeling interlaced with imagery. Hemingway decided upon a hard, spare, simple line in which even the connectives are the repetitive "and", "then", or "now" of common speech. There are moments in Hemingway when the emotional power of this style surpasses anything in the American idiom for immediate effect. Yet *The Sound And The Fury*, in its total impact, is superior to any novel Hemingway has written. It is probably not a matter of whether one style is superior to the other.

The spare, hard, almost journalistic vividness of Hemingway's style is completely suited to the simplicity of his romantic concept of sexual virility and its determining effect upon all things. Even his most romantic characters take on added realism in Hemingway, because of their speech, which is completely convincing to the ear. Many of us who have tried writing have paid indirect homage to his style by the qualities which we have learned from his dialogue and from his descriptive ability. And yet, were we to see life as reduced to the basic elements in a Hemingway story, we would fail not only to repeat his performance, but even to turn in a creditable performance of our own. The failure, indeed, of the "tough prose" writers, of O'Hara, for example, is their inability to feel with the moral earnestness, or with the romantic heroism of the man whom they chose as one of their teachers.

Of the three or four outstanding novelists since 1900 who are Americans, Hemingway is second only to Faulkner and probably first as an artist in the short story. The simplicity of his subject-matter, since he extracted the ultimate quality of it, and matched it with a completely appropriate style, proved to be his greatest strength. This is the kind of power which is generated by someone who knows how to work within his own limitations.

AVEL AUSTIN

Avel Austin is a graduate student at Columbia University.

The Fate of American Civil Liberties

Can Civil Liberties Survive the Decline of Laissez-Faire?

IT WILL no longer do to regard the current decline in American civil liberties as episodic. While it is true that there are many precedents for the details that enter into this decline, it is more important to emphasize that the general picture is far worse than any which existed in the past. Comparisons are difficult to draw for the present generation of American youth, which has been "acclimated" to abuses — even horrors — that in earlier days would have evoked wide public protests. The years before the first World War, when men moved across a relatively passportless world, when the right to asylum had a modicum of reality, when a Dreyfuss Trial or a Kishenev massacre raised the passions of millions in Europe and America, seem to belong to a legendary world.

Today, the statutes — federal, state and local — that inhibit civil liberties are legion. They are supplemented by agencies, oaths and even machines like the polygraph which decide in a perfectly arbitrary way whether individuals are "loyal," whether they are to hold jobs not only with the government but industries completely unrelated to military and political interests. For the first time in American history, two individuals have been sentenced to death for peace-time espionage, and are awaiting execution at this writing. In another case, a Stalinist, Steve Nelson, recently received the incredible sentence of twenty years imprisonment for violation of the Pennsylvania "subversive" statute. The press reports indicate that this unheard of sentence may be increased if a Federal indictment against Nelson is obtained.

One does not have to share Nelson's support of Russian totalitarianism to recognize what is involved. The laws which have been enacted over the past decade are part of a lasting, decisive trend away from the democratic traditions in American life. Their effect has been to create a profound sense of uneasiness and fear in the public, a paralysis in the expression of unorthodox opinions and ideas.

Civil Liberties Not Irrevocable

Let there be no mistake about the irrevocability of democratic rights in the United States — at least, so far as American officialdom is concerned. The distinctions which remain relatively clear in the traditions of British democracy have been too firm here. Indeed, the first modern concentration camps were not organized by the English during the Boer War; they appeared as early as 1897 in Idaho, when thousands of striking miners were imprisoned in mass "bull pens" by Federal and State troops.

Cynicism toward the constitutional rights of the people runs like a red thread through the behavior of the very authorities entrusted to protect these rights. When the Colorado state government was criticized fifty years ago for

its high-handed, unconstitutional treatment of the Cripple Creek strikers, the Judge-Advocate of the state replied: "To hell with the constitution; we are not following the Constitution." Here, too, "bull pens" were organized, habeas corpus suspended by the military, censorship established over the local press, and local property arbitrarily commandeered by the militia. This occurred not in wartime or "national emergency," but in response to a limited strike action conducted by Haywood's Western Federation of Miners. Neither the Judge-Advocate nor the military commanders were brought to trial for "subversion."

In part, this sort of behaviour can be attributed to the permeation of nearly every aspect of America by a hard and competitive industrial spirit. Perhaps no country in the world has made the conduct of government a "business" like the United States, with the concomitant use of "businessmen" and "business methods." Government resembles a commercial enterprise; it is bitten by a distinctly commercial spirit, with few serious traditions beyond those which have been cultivated in trade and industry. Even the jargon of government translates into civics what characteristically belongs to commerce. We speak of election "ballyhoo," of "trading votes," "advantages" and even political "positions." Party conventions parallel the conventions of salesmen on the loose, with hotel amours, snake-dances, card parties and whoopee.

The French politicians are noted for their classical rhetoric — everyone tries to be a Cicero; the English are distinguished by a decorous respectability and a traditional susceptibility to public opinion; American politicians are rightly characterized as "party bosses," with no traditions to support them other than those engendered in commerce. The result has been neither efficiency nor administrative superiority, but all the predatory attributes of bourgeois competition.

Decline of Capitalism

It should not be too surprising, therefore, that overall trends in civil liberties closely follow those in business. While American capitalism was an expanding system, the abuses and episodes of the past were cancelled out by political as well as economic gains. The democratic spirit celebrated in the poetry of Whitman and the prose of Mark Twain belongs to a period when the economy was moving forward in giant strides at home and to a leading position abroad. America was completing her laissez-faire development; the economic and social paralysis of a monopolistic economy was not, as yet, directly felt.

The first World War marks a turning point in this direction, perhaps less so in the United States than in Europe. Nonetheless, even in America the war pointed to an

overall decline. Economic primacy, which was distributed in the laissez-faire era among countless, atomized enterprises — each of which was not strong enough to dominate other enterprises — conclusively fell to giant domestic monopolies and international cartels. These monopolies and cartels, standing in the way of each other, began to block any further economic development. From an expanding system, capitalism slipped into stagnation. The basis for a development disappeared, and with it the old framework of civil liberties.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized how much the basis of American political life has changed from the "classical," laissez-faire era. Today, the aim of the United States, indeed, of bourgeois society as a whole, has shifted from a pursuit of markets to one of control and "stabilization." This is all the more the case because capital is now highly centralized and all the forces of economic and political coercion have been collected into relatively few hands. To permit a further expansion of the world economy is not only impossible on the premises of monopoly . . . it is meaningless. To do so would simply mean to strengthen capitalist rivals for supremacy abroad and upset all the social relations at home.

The tendencies which now appear are decisively antithetical to those which existed in the past. Advanced capitalist countries are annexed (Germany and Japan) by America; their economies are directly or indirectly circumscribed (dismantlings, Schuman plans); "surplus," populations which were once labor reserves indispensable to the expansion of industry, face planned destruction (genocide, neo-Malthusianism, slave labor camps.) The old democratic framework no longer conforms to the new direction of capitalism. Civil-liberties violations, which were once compensated for by the over-all political and economic upswing, have formed a pattern that is pointed toward totalitarianism.

Indeed, the very fact that America has the industry and abundance to resolve the economic difficulties of our time, tends to require repressive techniques of unparalleled ferocity; the fuel is supplied by the contrast between what exists and what *could* exist under a rational organization of society. Although repression has still to complete most of its development in the United States, the "peculiarities" of our background, its cult of business and even its racial and cultural anomosities — in a word, the incompleteness and unevenness of social life in America, combine to suggest the picture of an infant playing with an atom bomb.

Rise of the FBI

It is characteristic of this unevenness that the kernel of everything contains its opposite; that America, the country least threatened militarily in the first World War, had the most totalitarian industrial mobilization and, now, with the most democratic pretensions, celebrates one of the largest secret police agencies in the West; the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Again, it is characteristic that this agency, which dedicates itself to preserving the laws of the land, started as an *illegal* body and throughout its career has consistently violated the laws it claims to protect.

Like the Gestapo and MVD, the FBI has assumed an autonomy and initiative of its own, going beyond the immediate exigencies that are said to require its existence. It appears where it isn't wanted; it acts where it isn't needed; it creates situations where none actually exist; it performs activities outside its legal jurisdiction; it conceals or invents data according to its own requirements — in short, it leads the corroding life of a cancer in the democratic life of the country. The FBI has grown to such dimensions that a special culture, including radio programs and motion pictures, surrounds its activities. From a modest annual budget of 2 to 3 million dollars during the early years of its existence, the appropriations for this agency have swelled to 53 million dollars in 1950. The greatest absolute increase in funds occurred after the second World War.

The very existence of a centralized Federal police force is antithetical to the premises of American democratic theory. When the Bureau was first opened in 1907 by Attorney C. J. Bonaparte, the proposal met with a storm of protest in Congress. "No general system of spying upon and espionage of the people, such as has prevailed in Russia, in France under the Empire, and at one time in Ireland," warned Congressman Smith of Iowa, "should be allowed to grow up." As Max Lowenthal observes in *The Federal Bureau of Investigation*, (William Sloane Assoc. 1950):

The views of Congress were summarized in a Chicago news article published some time before and reprinted in the Congressional Record during the debates: "There is no desire for a general detective service or national police organization in connection with the Federal Government. On the contrary, there is in Congress an utter abhorrence of such a scheme. . . It is considered absolutely contradictory to the democratic principles of government."

The proposal was not only rejected, but to emphasize its hostility Congress undertook an investigation of existing police agencies under Federal jurisdiction. Nonetheless, against the wishes of the legislators and behind their backs, Bonaparte created the Bureau of Investigation and presented the following Congress with a fait accompli. At the outset, therefore, the agency was an illegal body. It was created over Congressional protest by an appointed Executive officer; funds for its existence were originally allocated from reserves which were never appropriated with a Federal police force in mind. Its existence was finally acknowledged on the supposition that it would remain a very modest body, confining its attention to a marginal area of criminal activity.

Despite all of these qualifications, the debate continued and threatened to result in the dissolution of the Bureau. Partly to assure its acceptance and partly to buttress the Administration, the new Federal detectives were assigned to shadow opposition Congressmen, rifle their mail and prepare embarrassing personal dossiers. When this scandalous behaviour came to the attention of the press, ". . . the President denied this, insisting that detectives whose job it was to ferret out criminals would not themselves violate the law by opening other people's mail packages. "But sometimes," he added, "though the accidental breaking of such package the contents are exposed." With this explana-

tion, he published the private correspondence of Senator Tillman of South Carolina, who had been especially fiery in his opposition to the Administration."

Thus, with Theodore Roosevelt for its Sire and Charles J. Bonaparte at its Mid-wife, the Bureau came into existence.

Clear It With J. Edgar

Space does not make it possible to suggest the devastating wealth of detail in Lowenthal's discussion of the FBI. The origins of this agency are of interest, however, because they point up the logic in such examples. From very modest although unsavory beginnings, the FBI has now acquired the authority for preparing much of the ideological fabric of social rights in the United States. It submits an official interpretation of socialist theory; it digests the meaning and extent of "subversion" for legislators; it opens new crevices in the crumbling edifice of civil liberties. A police framework of discussion has been created, to which many individuals are increasingly compelled to adapt themselves. Indeed, a new experience has appeared in American life: "clearance" with the FBI.

The very concept of "clearance," like the practice of "loyalty oaths," is juridically unique. As one writer on the subject suggests, the entire American people are regarded as suspect until they are "cleared and pledged." The State of California presumably had this in mind when it sought to impose loyalty oaths not only on its officialdom, but also on anyone who applies for a state license. Hollywood, radio networks, and corporations, by following suit, are no longer testing the overt actions of their employees; they are challenging their intellectual orientation. The issue is writ large and encroaches on the population as a whole. If a licensed plumber is not qualified to practice his trade because of his political reservations, there is not much in principle that keeps a tramp out of an Arizona concentration camp. A scrupulous division of labor prepares this direction. While the government pretends to be reluctant about enacting "oaths," "clearances" and using concentration camps (for which regular budgetary allotments are still being made), civic organizations, the American Legion and certain legislators heckle vigorously on the side-lines for more stringent measures. After a certain amount of time, the government yields and then goes into mourning for a decent amount of time . . . until it "gives way" again. It would be a grave mistake to regard a Senator McCarthy as a "crackpot"; he is a *pioneer*, with the privilege of usually *saying* what Messrs Truman, Eisenhower and/or Stevenson will *do*.

This is illustrated by the progress of the Federal Loyalty Program over the past two years. When the question of oaths, pledges, investigations and dismissals came its way, the Administration struck several contradictory postures, simultaneously and consecutively. Truman was not adverse to a Loyalty Program of some sort; no — he did not find it objectionable that Communists should be removed from the Federal payroll; yes — he did feel that subversives were a danger to the security of the United States. His objections centered on the militancy of McCarthy's

endeavors and particularly on the anti-Administration character of attacks. The result was a "compromise," which created the Inter-Departmental Committee on Internal Security and the various departmental loyalty boards. The essential reaction of the Administration was that it was yielding to exigencies, that the pressure of Congressional and public criticism obliged Truman to go against his own sound and very democratic judgment.

Once accepted, however, the Program was literally galvanized into action. Executive officers, like the Attorney-General began to formulate standards of subversion in such a high-handed manner that court rulings were soon obtained against the arbitrary criteria employed. It is not a tribute to the judicial division of the government that these techniques were impossible to sustain; it remains a sinister commentary on the Administration's duplicity that it condemned McCarthy on Mondays and zealously executed his demands on Tuesdays. The Passport Division of the State Department, in particular, established a formidable precedent by arbitrarily denying many citizens the practical possibility of traveling abroad. While hearings, appeals and the most elementary requests for defense against rulings were being turned down by this bureaucratic agency, Truman continued to affront public intelligence by deploring the rhetorical excesses of McCarthy.

The latest reports now indicate that the Loyalty Program is to be reorganized. More precisely, Truman has instructed the Civil Service Commission to plan the co-ordination of all existing programs into a unified system. The apparent aim of this directive is to render the Loyalty Program more efficient, uniform and, consequently, more effective. The program is not only being taken for granted; it is being rendered symmetrical and cohesive. A hierarchy is growing up within the hierarchy of the State, a government to supervise the government, with no adequate standing in legislation or judicial review. Terms like "re-organization" conceal a systematic knitting together of the loose-strands which existed when the pretense of "reluctance" was still before the public eye.

Witch-hunt from Below

Techniques which the Administration is still obliged to forego or conceal, assume a characteristically exaggerated form in lower echelons of authority. While Truman was parading his qualms before the public, municipalities, movie producers and corporations followed the logic of the situation that was being created in more "responsible" quarters. In several communities (Birmingham, Macon and Jacksonville), Communists were summarily ordered to leave town regardless of the property or jobs they held. Other towns ordered the immediate registration of all Communists and fellow-travelers, which often meant anyone of heterodox persuasions. In Detroit, the chief of police was dignified with the warrant to decide what type of literature was "subversive" and to prohibit its distribution. The mayor of Los Angeles publicly advised the people of the city to report all politically suspicious individuals and promised to conceal the identity of the accusers from the accused. The General Foods Corporation withdrew its

sponsorship of Jean Muir as television's "Mother Aldrich" because a number of individuals protested she had belonged to fellow-traveling movements. In fact, one Hollywood producer was so frightened by the hysteria whipped up that he abandoned a projected film on the legend of Hiawatha. He was afraid that movie-goers would associate a peace-pipe scene with the Stockholm Peace Petition.

The behavior of many leading American universities reached scandalous proportions. An epidemic of loyalty oaths, investigations, recriminations and firings swept the country. Textbooks were re-examined for subversion and criticism reached out to encompass such semi-classics as Beard's *Rise of American Civilization*. In Georgia, the State Board of Education temporarily suspended the use of Frank Magruder's *American Government* (an absurdly conformist book) and, what is more indicative, the New York State Board appointed a commission to investigate subversive school texts.

Veterans organizations joined forces to demand, in one case, the execution of all subversives, and in another, their incarceration in concentration camps. They may have been pleased to learn that the government continues at fairly high expense to maintain such camps (as yet unoccupied) in Nevada and Arizona. The Smith Act, as a matter of course, enjoyed a new vogue since its application against the Trotskyists ten years ago. Stalinist leaders, who once applauded its enforcement against the latter, were placed on trial and various states undertook to try and imprison Stalinists of local importance. When a new immigration law came to the attention of Congress, it was cast to conform to the prevailing atmosphere. Not only are some of the worst features of the earlier bill retained, but immigrants as well as all aliens are now required to register annually with the government.

The responsibility for this behavior must be placed *in toto* at the door of the administration, which had to know that any opening of the dykes on top would threaten a flood below.

The Liberals and the Labor Movement

The significance of the "Loyalty Program" can be measured not only in terms of the Administration's initiative, but also in terms of the unprecedented collapse of liberal and labor opposition to its execution. Virtually all the organized bodies like the union federations, liberal civil-liberties groups, legal agencies and parliamentary committees, which checked many civil-liberty violations in the past, have surrendered in one way or another, directly or indirectly, to the Administration. Again, the division of labor comes into play. Attacks upon McCarthy and McCarran have raised a smoke screen behind which the Administration has been able to impose the essentials of the very program these Senators advocate. An integral part of this smokescreen is the claque of liberal and labor "democrats," who, while reviling McCarthy and McCarran, decorate the landscape of the policies so assiduously followed by Truman.

The microscopic debate on civil liberties, which the liberals have been carrying on in parlor magazines like

Commentary, is illustrative. Unimaginative questions such as: "Do We Defend Our Rights By Defending Communists?" have indeed given a defensive coloration to the entire issue. Even to this type of question it is impossible to collect a unified, still less militant, opinion. In almost every case, the fabric of civil liberties has not been handled on its own merits, but is carefully embroidered into American foreign policy. Civil liberties, so far as these people are concerned, is a detail of the so-called "cold war," and the liberals have been reduced to the role of undignified handmaidens of the State Department.

What of the Labor movement? Well, it may be a trifle vulgar although not too unexpected for a labor leader to tour steel plants with a corporation president, but it may be regarded as remarkable for entire labor federations to turn their backside on an unprecedented decline in civil liberties. Yet this, in substance, is what is happening. The American labor movement has delivered its capacities for struggle to the corporations, to the Democratic Party, to the government — to anyone you please, but not to the opponents of an American Gleichschaltung.

The American labor movement, as a defender of civil liberties, has been tried and found wanting. This does not diminish the importance of class conflicts today or in the past, or of class interests behind civil liberties' violations. The social pattern, however, is not as neat as some people think and in America it has been considerably reshuffled. If American fascism comes of age, it will be "cold" not "warm." It will rely less on a mass movement and more on bureaucratic connections, with repressive techniques that may well make the Stalinists look like novices. The labor movement is not excluded from these connections; in fact, it is currently contributing to the tapestry of social control.

It is of pressing necessity to re-group the traditional picture that exists about civil liberties and freedom in the United States. On such a re-grouping depends a meaningful view of civil liberties and the allegiances which will mobilize forces in an intelligent struggle. The first element of the past that must find its way into the dust-bin is the framework of the *real politiker*, which casts political action only in terms of given "power" elements like the Democratic or Liberal parties. For millions of Americans, an overturn in consciousness is being prepared by the problems of our time. The mass media is losing its influence; a submerged revulsion against the techniques of manipulation is taking place; a profound hatred for the Korean War, the "emergency" war of nerves, is widespread. A successful defense and extension of our civil liberties will find its roots not in the mechanism of existing political relationships, but only in the organization of these growing, although as yet diffuse, sentiments in the population. And whoever or whatever organization presumes to reach the population with a message of democracy must answer for the independence of his person and the seriousness of his purpose.

HARRY LUDD

Harry Ludd is a writer on the American political-economy and an editor of *Contemporary Issues*.

The Revolution in South Africa

Civil Disobedience Against Government's Racist Laws

I SPENT MOST of a morning with the late Canada Lee shortly after he had returned from South Africa, where the movie, "Cry the Beloved Country," had been filmed. I asked him how conditions in South Africa compared with the Southern part of the United States. He replied very quickly: "Compared with South Africa, the South is heaven!" Even Canada Lee had to gain entrance to South Africa through the fiction that he was a bonded servant.

Probably the most hopeful sign of a democratic upsurging in the world today is the non-violent resistance movement against racial laws in South Africa. It was in this same South Africa at the turn of the century that Mohandas Gandhi, then an unknown young attorney, got his start. Here he first conceived of the technique of disciplined non-violent action as an effective method for a seemingly defenseless people to resist injustices. Here he gained the valuable experience which made it possible for him to return to India to make the Indian National Congress into an effective instrument for the ultimate independence of his country. But in South Africa no movement comparable to the Indian Congress came into being. Anyone who has read books such as *Cry the Beloved Country* or *Black Hamlet* should realize that the conditions were ripe for a non-cooperation campaign, but the people did not seem to be ready. It has been reported that as many as 100,000 native Africans a year were found guilty of violating such laws as those demanding that all non-Europeans be off the street by 11:00 p.m., and yet it was not planned action, not part of a campaign. The people who were fined or given twenty days of hard labor for this transgression of the law were innocent violators not knowing and self-conscious resisters.

Initial Skepticism

Perhaps the non-existence of any strong organized effort for resistance to the apartheid (segregation) laws is the main reason why the announcement last December by the African National Congress of plans for a civil disobedience campaign was not taken very seriously. The leader of a group calling itself the African Democratic Party, spoken of as a "more forthright" organization than the African National Congress by Alan Paton in his Public Affairs pamphlet *South Africa Today*, wrote me: "They (the African National Congress) have committed themselves to something they are not able to carry out. Such an ill-considered campaign must result in frustration and disillusionment for the mass of the people. Both sections of the herrenvolk know this. That is why their press boosted the campaign far beyond its importance."

Others with whom I was in correspondence were skepti-

cal that the nonviolent character of the movement could be maintained. Liberal-minded white people indicated they were in sympathy with the aims of the campaign, but certain that much more evil than good would come from it because it was premature. The South African Institute of Race Relations, a predominantly white educational organization, passed a resolution stating in part: "The Institute would be failing in its duty if it did not state that the present racial situation in the Union is so tense that such demonstrations are likely to get out of hand . . . The Institute appeals to African leaders to defer their plans. . ."

But now the movement is taken seriously. The latest report (end of August) is that more than 3,000 volunteers have been arrested. A white friend wrote recently saying that he had been doubtful of the campaign originally, but that he was amazed how the volunteers had maintained their nonviolent discipline. Then he added: "Perhaps my doubt simply reveals my own lack of courage to participate in the movement." A most significant clipping from the *Daily Dispatch*, an English publication from East London, South Africa, was sent to me a few days ago. The article compared the terrorism of the French Revolution with the uprising in South Africa. It said: "We hope not to see a guillotine erected in Church Square, Capetown, or Pretoria, but scenes such as those witnessed outside the Magistrate's Court on Monday — scenes which are being duplicated all over the country — should serve as a warning to the Government. South Africa's *hoi polloi* is becoming restive . . . At the moment it is a mild form of revolution . . . The Government may continue to ignore that warning and put the offenders in gaol, but it will do so at its own peril."

The first announcement of plans for the current civil disobedience movement was made following the conference of the African National Congress last December. At that time this Congress committed itself to join with the South African Indian Congress and the Franchise Action Council (representing the so-called colored group of European-African mixed blood) in a non-cooperative campaign. A Joint Planning Council of these groups was formed to prepare for the movement. This in itself was significant, for this was the first time organizations representing these groups had ever cooperated in a joint effort.

The Joint Planning Council named April 6th, the 300th anniversary of the coming of the white man to South Africa, as the date for action to begin. Later April 6th was used only as a day for demonstration, and June 26th was the actual start of civil disobedience. The high note on which the planning was done is indicated by this section from the Manifesto: "The struggle which the national organizations of the non-European people are conducting is not directed against any race or national group. It is against

the unjust laws which keep in perpetual subjection and misery vast sections of the population. It is for the transformation of conditions which will restore human dignity, equality, and freedom to every South African."

Malan's Racism

Copies of this manifesto together with fully explanatory letters were sent to the Prime Minister, Dr. D. F. Malan. He responded by saying that "The Government will make full use of the machinery at its disposal to quell any disturbances . . ." He indicated the government had no intention of abolishing any of the racist laws. He stated the full racist doctrine of his government when he said: "It is self-contradictory to claim as an inherent right of the Bantu, who differ in many ways from the Europeans, that they should be regarded as not different, especially when it is borne in mind that these differences are permanent and non man-made."

The Joint Planning Council had given the government until the end of February, 1952, (about two months) to indicate that some action would be taken toward abolishing the following laws:

1. The pass laws which require evidence of employment and permission to be in certain areas at certain times;
2. Group Areas Act, which stipulates that each racial group (Africans, Indians, Coloured, and Europeans) live and do business in its own area only;
3. Separate Registration of Voters Act, which put all non-whites into one category and disfranchised one million coloured voters;
4. Bantu Authorities Act, which perpetuates the fiction that Africans are still organized as tribes, and gives consequent powers to chiefs, ignoring the fact that in African society urbanization is displacing the previous rural organization of the people;
6. General apartheid laws which demand segregation in public places, stations, trains, etc., such as in the Southern part of the United States.

Greatest responsibility for this movement obviously fell to the African National Congress. Although its membership was small compared to the 8,000,000 Africans who potentially could affiliate, the brunt of the injustice has always been borne by the African native. There are only about 250,000 Indians in South Africa, and about one million colored people.

Various reports reached us in this country about the demonstrations on April 6th. Our newspapers and British publications such as the *New Statesman and Nation* indicated the meetings were small and uninspired. However, I have recently talked with Professor Z. K. Matthews, who is in this country for one year and who is the president of the Cape Province African National Congress. He indicates that the April 6th meetings were attended all told by close to 100,000 people, and successful beyond the hopes of the Congress leaders.

The campaign is divided into three stages:

1. Commencement of the struggle by calling upon selected

and trained persons to go into action in big centers such as Johannesburg, Cape Town, Bloemfontein, Port Elizabeth, and Durban.

2. The number of volunteer corps to be increased as well as the number of centers of operation.
3. Mass action during which the struggle will broaden out on a country-wide scale.

I assume from the reports which have been received that the first stage has been ended and the second has begun. The major leaders of the movement have been arrested, including the general secretaries, W. M. Sisulu and Y. A. Cachalia, and the president of the African National Congress, Dr. J. S. Moroka. The movement is spreading. Ten thousand volunteers have been called for who are willing to be arrested and suffer imprisonment at hard labor or public caning (whipping). Week after week more people continue to volunteer.

Each volunteer takes a pledge: "We, the oppressed people of South Africa, hereby solemnly pledge ourselves to carry on a relentless struggle to repeal the unjust laws as laid down in the plan for action . . . We shall do all in our power, to the utmost limits of endurance and sacrifice, to carry out the Congress call against the unjust laws which subject our people to political servility, economic misery, and social degradation. From this day forward we, as disciplined men and women, dedicate our lives to the struggle for freedom and fundamental rights."

The original plan was that there should be in the neighborhood of 200 offenses committed each week. So far there have been considerably more. It was reported in a Reuters dispatch in the *New York Times* that 426 persons had been arrested on August 26th alone. On the opening day of the campaign (June 26th) about 170 were arrested in Port Elizabeth and Johannesburg. In Port Elizabeth the defiance took the form of crossing the railway bridge reserved for Europeans at 7 a.m. A band of police was there to meet the demonstrators. A brief discussion with the police took place, followed by the singing of the national hymn, "Come Back Africa." Then the demonstrators marched past the police to the other side of the bridge. Police cans were waiting for them there and all were arrested.

Near Johannesburg a group of fifty volunteers led by W. M. Sisulu attempted to defy the Urban Areas Act by entering the Boksburg location without a permit. The municipal authorities had the gates shut just as the demonstrators were about to enter. Waiting police arrested the volunteers, who sang Congress songs as they were driven off to the police station.

A second group of 54 was arrested in Johannesburg at 11:30 p.m. on June 26th for defying the Curfew Regulations. When accosted by police Mr. Boshelo, chairman of the Central Johannesburg Congress Branch, replied: "We are nonviolent fighters for freedom. We are going to defy regulations that have kept our fathers in bondage."

That the volunteers mean to keep the movement non-violent is attested to by the fact that in spite of the more than 3,000 arrests, no violent outbreak has occurred. In the *New York Times* of June 27th, Dr. Moroka is quoted

as saying: "I hope the police won't do anything to provoke trouble and will merely keep order, because our people will submit to anything that will be done to them without restraint."

At the trial of twenty top leaders of the movement on August 26th a huge crowd gathered outside the court. Their singing and cheering was making so much noise that the hearing could not start for fifteen minutes. According to the *New York Times* of August 27th, Dr. Moroka, finally went outside the court and asked for silence. Immediately a hush went over the whole gathering and the proceedings inside began. Although no document I have yet seen outlines specifically what is involved in a non-violent discipline, nor is there anyone near the stature of a Gandhi on the horizon, the importance of nonviolence is implied in numerous statements. A statement issued at a joint meeting of the African and Indian Congresses on May 31st in Port Elizabeth ends: "The inner citadel of our strength and the foundations for a free South Africa lie along the path of a well-disciplined and nonviolent struggle for the removal of the unjust laws."

Police Intimidation

The police have been much less restrained, but as yet there has been remarkably little violence even from this source. The Minister of Justice has laid the way open for more police violence, however, in a public statement in which he said: "If the policemen go slightly beyond the limits of their powers . . . they should not be condemned in view of their difficult tasks," and that "while it is possible that innocent people had been struck by police batons it was just too bad if such people got hurt." Early in August the police raided the offices of the groups sponsoring the campaign as well as the homes of leaders of the movement. They seized papers and documents which are being used to try twenty leaders under the Suppression of Communism Act.

The sentences imposed on volunteers have ranged from 15 days' hard labor or two pounds fine to 40 days' labor or ten pounds fine. All volunteers have refused to pay fines. Youth under 21 years of age have been sentenced to caning. Interestingly enough 73 volunteers who defied post office apartheid were acquitted because, although partitions to establish segregation in post offices had been erected, there was found to be nothing in the postal regulations to enforce apartheid.

The question may well be asked if the movement is Communist inspired or if there are Communists active in it. According to information gained from correspondence with persons like Manilal Gandhi, the son of Mohandas Gandhi, and talks with South Africans in this country as well as Americans who have been in South Africa recently, there are some Communists in the movement. Especially in the leadership of the South African Indian Congress, the Communists are represented. The statement which A. T. Steele made in a dispatch to the *New York Herald Tribune* of August 14th probably sizes up the situation pretty accurately. He said: "There is little doubt that some Com-

munist have infiltrated the passive resistance movement, though identifying them is no simple matter. In any case it is apparent that the great majority of those participating in the movement have no Communist connections."

Two brief comments should be made on this problem. First, we should expect Communists to be involved in this kind of campaign precisely because they are anxious to seize upon any revolutionary movement to turn it to their own ends. But this is not a movement which they have created. It has roots deep in the injustices of the white man and his civilization to the African. For anti-Communists to argue that they should get out of the movement because some Communists are in it would be to abandon the field. This would be a tragic mistake. This is not the same issue at all as united front activity with the Communists in a fairly stable situation as in the United States.

The other comment is that the movement has been maintaining its nonviolent approach. This is not to say that non-violence goes deep necessarily. But the non-violent tactic is official policy. It is hoped that the number in the movement who believe in this approach on principle, many of them as followers of Gandhi, will grow as the effectiveness of the movement grows.

Of course the South African government makes a terrible mistake in trying the leaders of the campaign under the Suppression of Communism Act. The statement which the Magistrate made in denying the "not guilty" plea of these leaders is revealing of the government's position. He said: "It is common knowledge that one of the aims of Communism is to break down race barriers and strive for equal rights for all sections of the people, and to do without any discrimination of race, colour, or creed. The Union of South Africa is fertile ground for the dissemination of Communist propaganda. This would endanger the survival of Europeans, and therefore legislation must be pursued with the object of suppressing Communism."

I have not spent any space in this article touching on the major political situation of Malan's Nationalist Party versus the British United Party. This has been discussed in the daily press in this country. In spite of the fact that this political crisis was brought about by the narrowly nationalist and high-handed tactics of the Malan forces, this issue is really irrelevant to the movement of civil disobedience. A representative of the United Party was quoted in the *New York Times* a few days ago to the effect that if the natives continued with their campaign, the whites would be forced to join in suppressing the movement. The supremacy of the European must be maintained, he said. The non-whites know this. That is why their movement is revolutionary and should be so. For, as the Manifesto of the movement says: "It is for the transformation of conditions which will restore human dignity, equality, and freedom to every South African."

GEORGE HOUSER

George Houser is executive secretary of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), and of Americans for South African Resistance, and is on the staff of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Shaw and the Social Role of Drama

Moral Considerations at the Heart of Shaw's Art

In order to gain a hearing it was necessary for me to attain the footing of a privileged lunatic, with the licence of a jester. My method has therefore been to take the utmost trouble to find the right thing to say and then say it with the utmost levity. And all the time the real joke is that I am in earnest.

Bernard Shaw

DESPITE HIS OCCASIONAL airs, it is a reckless absurdity to think of Shaw as a Man of Letters and then expect him to behave like one. Dixon Scott, for instance, did this in his otherwise perceptive essay "The Innocence of Bernard Shaw."¹ His fundamental point boils down to a wistful regret that Shaw stuck to those ideas of his, instead of "outgrowing" them and becoming an artist with more "gentleness" (both figuratively and literal) in his outlook. Needless to say, Scott's estimate of Shaw was thus warped; he tried to judge Shaw in terms of "pure" art, and though he probably understood Shaw's mind better than anybody who has written on Shaw, his comments show an obstinate refusal to cope with Shaw's work in Shaw's own terms. He even goes so far as to recommend that Shaw should have admitted that "Tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner" — a doctrine whose perniciousness was to Shaw without limits.

The Social Importance of Art

Shaw made no bones about his ideas on art in general; he wrote as a critic of London music, drama, and painting for many years, and wrote three major essays putting forward his views on artistic activity (*The Perfect Wagnerite*, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, and *The Sanity of Art*). Yet critics have persistently neglected these declarations; even so sophisticated a writer as T. S. Eliot has fallen into cavilling at Shaw because his work did not conform to Eliot's ideas about the function of art. Of course not: but the real question is whether Shaw was better, or worse than the type of artist Eliot would have preferred him to be. Here Shaw and Eliot stand utterly opposed.²

Shaw had, to begin with, a healthy (perhaps exaggerated) respect for the social importance of art:

The valid point is that our artistic institutions are vital social organs, and that the advance of civilization tends constantly to make them, especially in the presence of democratic institutions and compulsory schooling, more important than the political and ecclesiastical institutions whose traditional prestige is so much greater.³

¹ In *Men of Letters*, London, 1916.

² It is worth noting that Eliot once declared, "The potent ju-ju of the Life Force is a gross superstition," yet went on (in *The Cocktail Party* especially) to produce a great amount of ju-ju of his own.

³ Aylmer Maude, "Tolstoi on Art" and its Critics, London, 1925, p. 10.

Harsh words indeed for Mr. Eliot. Furthermore,

Art is socially important. . . only in so far as it wields that power of propagating feeling which he [Tolstoi] adopts as his criterion of true art. It is hard to knock this truth into the heads of the English nation. We admit the importance of public opinion, which in a country without intellectual habits (our own, for example) depends altogether on public feeling. Yet instead of perceiving the gigantic importance which this gives to the theater, the concert-room and the bookshop as forcing-houses of feeling, we slight them as mere places of amusement.⁴

Shaw was one of the first thus to perceive the social role of art; and since in his plays he constantly examined life for its social meanings he was constantly misunderstood and attacked both by those who wished he would have concerned himself with more familiar meanings, and by those who abhorred his interpretation of what he saw. It is commonplace that men who refuse to work within an established tradition become suspect — even when, as in Shaw's case, there is no strong established tradition in Eliot's sense. Shaw was trying to establish a new tradition, not utilize the old one; in fact, he exerted himself to the utmost to destroy what was left of the old one. Shaw often emphasized effect more than expressive form; he was, again, something either better or worse than an artist working in a solid tradition. He himself once said that an Ibsen play, though it will be dead in the future when *Midsummer Night's Dream* is still lively, will have been far more useful. In brief, he was more concerned with the transformation of society than with "pure" esthetics — though his critical writings bear ample testimony to his taste and perception, and his plays are by no means mere dramatized tracts.

Socialism a "Dramatic Illusion"

A good way to get a perspective on Shaw's thought about drama (he had a writing career of seventy years, and such a perspective is not easy to get) is to examine an essay written in 1896, "The Illusion of Socialism." In this essay Shaw considered socialism under its dual aspects of science and propaganda, using the term "illusion" in a fairly technical sense and not always dyslogistically. He began by indicating his conception of the nature of socialism as a doctrine and movement. Turning to the central question, he continued:

The dramatic illusion of Socialism is that which presents the working-class as a virtuous hero and heroine in the toils of a villain called "the capitalist," suffering terribly and struggling nobly, but with a happy ending for them, and a fearful retribution for the villain, in full view before the fall of the curtain on a future of undisturbed bliss. . . .

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

Closely allied to the dramatic illusion, and indeed at bottom the same thing, is the religious illusion. This presents Socialism as consummating itself by a great day of wrath, called "The Revolution" in which capitalism, commercialism, competition, and all the lusts of the Exchange, shall be brought to judgment and cast out, leaving the earth free for the kingdom of heaven on earth, all of which is revealed in an infallible book by a great prophet and leader. . . . The working-man who has been detached from the Established Church or the sects by the Secularist propaganda, and who . . . strenuously denies or contemptuously ridicules the current beliefs in heavens and devils and bibles, will, with the greatest relief and avidity, go back to his old habits of thought and imagination when they appear in this secular form.⁶

The scientific side of socialism displays the same sort of process:

Socialism has for its economic basis two theories, the theory of Rent and the theory of Value. The first of these seems simple to those who have mastered it; but it is neither obvious nor easy to the average sympathetic man: indeed, men of first-rate ability, among them Adam Smith, Marx, and Ruskin, have blundered over it. . . . The theory of value has a different history. . . . It began by being simple enough for the most unsophisticated audience, and ended by becoming so subtle that its popularization is out of the question, especially as the old theory is helped by the sentiments of approbation it excites. . . . The result is that the old theory is the only one available for general use among Socialists. It has accordingly been adopted by them in the form . . . laid down in the first volume of Karl Marx's "Capital." It is erroneous and obsolete; it has been modified out of existence by Marx himself in his third volume; it would, if it were valid, disprove the existence of "surplus value" instead of proving it. . . .⁷

But in his conclusion Shaw said:

Please remember, still in the true Jevonian spirit, that the question is not whether illusions are useful or not, but exactly how useful they are.⁸

In the light of these comments we can see that Shaw's own plays were by no means intended as didactic in the ordinary socialist sense: they did not present messages for the daily guidance of agitators, nor did they pretend to address the proletariat. Shaw's entire dramatic activity lay within the confines of the British bourgeois world — though in his early Fabian days he was an active lecturer and speaker to labor groups. He was essentially a borer-from-within;⁹ his effect in helping to loosen the grip of the Victorian age was greater than his effect in producing anything new. As Dmitri Mirsky put it,

The combination . . . of fabian socialism and an ethical individualism turned all the 19th century notions of the bourgeoisie upside down. . . . It was just this reversal of the conception of human conduct which was still ruling that made Shaw into the professional paradox-maker the British see in him.¹⁰

⁶ Ibid., p. 159.

⁷ Ibid., p. 164.

⁸ Ibid., p. 171. The tactical spirit of this is quite pervasive in Shaw, but rarely commented upon by critics compelled to simplify Shaw for purposes of discussion.

⁹ Though he played in a different league, Shaw shows certain resemblances to two of our own borers-from-within, H. L. Mencken and Phillip Wylie.

¹⁰ The Intelligentsia of Great Britain, London, 1935.

Nevertheless, it is incorrect to charge Shaw with being a simple individualist; he incessantly proclaimed the need for "responsibility" and was sharp in his criticism of rank individualism: release from moral obligations, he noted acidly, is the "indispensable condition which appears to lie at the back of the popular conception of Paradise in all countries."¹¹

What was the change that took place in British drama in Shaw's day? Speaking primarily of Ibsen, Shaw thus described the New Drama:¹²

Now an interesting play cannot in the nature of things mean anything but a play in which problems of conduct and character of personal importance to the audience are raised and suggestively discussed (p. 217). . . . In the new plays, the drama arises through a conflict of unsettled ideas rather than through vulgar attachments, rapacities, generosities, resentments, ambitions, misunderstandings, oddities, and so forth as to which no moral question is raised. The conflict is not between right and wrong: the villain is as conscientious as the hero, if not more so; in fact, the question which makes the play interesting (when it is interesting) is which is the villain and which the hero. Or, to put it another way, there are no villains and no heroes. . . (p. 221).

But Shaw was no advocate of the puppet-play theory, though he is said to have been called a "ventriloquist"; his plays were intended as drama-of-the-people-with-ideas, not simply as drama-of-ideas:

There is only one way of dramatizing an idea; and that is by putting on the stage a human being possessed by that idea, yet none the less a human being with all the human impulses which make him akin and therefore interesting to us.¹³

But . . . the new technique is new only on the modern stage. It has been used by preachers and orators ever since speech was invented. It is the technique of playing upon the human conscience; and it has been practiced whenever the playwright has been capable of it. . . . In the theatre of Ibsen, we are . . . 'guilty creatures sitting at a play'; and the technique of pastime is no more applicable than at a murder trial.¹⁴

The Heart of Shaw's Art

Thus we arrive at the heart of Shaw's role as a propagandist: his moral function. He was prepared to sacrifice himself to it — and perhaps he did. He saw the theatrical world as a place where a deadly warfare went on: "each play is a battle."¹⁵ "It really matters very little," he said, "whether Ibsen was a great man or not: what does matter is his message and the need for it."¹⁶ This streak of devotion to his task is of course coupled with an enormous cocksureness — part of his pose as a jester to the ruling bourgeoisie. (Given his talents, it is not fair to arraign Shaw for not becoming a trade union organizer; actually, he saw his work and went to it with remarkable directness.)

It is well worth considering Shaw's notion of morals in the context of his dramatic thought. For example, an

¹¹ Dramatic Opinions, Vol. I, New York, 1907, p. xxiii.

¹² Quintessence of Ibsenism, New York, 1928.

¹³ The Perfect Wagnerite, New York, 1929, pp. 30-31.

¹⁴ Quintessence of Ibsenism, p. 133.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. x.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. x.

examination of the occurrence of the term *will* in his references to practical political problems demonstrates that will was often an extremely immediate phenomenon for Shaw; later he elaborated his notion of will into a vitalist theory coordinated with — but sometimes obscuring — his socialism; *will* became roughly equivalent to *life* or *life force*, the metaphysical ground upon which Shaw chose to rest his moral thought. The basic generative proposition for Shaw in morals seems to be this: "Men are to some extent conscious agents, and therefore morals, and the moral side of political science and art, are to some extent a matter of conscious debate and decision." The aspects which were *not* conscious, Shaw tended to neglect; his activities were primarily propagandistic, *i.e.*, as closely related to action as he could manage, contrary to the view of Caudwell and others.¹⁷

Like any socialist propagandist, he believed that propaganda and leadership could hasten and direct social change, given certain conditions to work with; but as he got older he concentrated his attention increasingly on leadership and decreasingly on its social prerequisites. It is idle to pretend, on this score, that Shaw did not issue some suspicious statements in the latter years of his life. His actual statements about Mussolini and Stalin, however, were much more seriously qualified than they are usually given out to be. His remarks on the Communist Party as a replica of the Catholic Church, for instance, have been put up as some sort of damning evidence; whereas actually they are a choice example of what made A. Lunacharsky uneasy on the occasion of Shaw's visit to the U.S.S.R.: "People like Bernard Shaw, brilliant representatives of the intelligentsia, show themselves to be 'too' free . . . they begin to indulge in irony." (He attributed to Shaw a "sympathy that is mingled with humor, because it seems to him that these fighters [the Russians] are rather ponderous, dogmatically credulous people."¹⁸

Shaw as Iconoclast

Now although Shaw worked within (and upon) the British middle class, he had by no means an easy time of it.

Every step in morals is made by challenging the validity of the existing conception of perfect propriety of conduct; and when a man does that, he must look out for a very different reception from the painter who has ventured to paint a shadow brilliant lilac, or the composer who ends his symphony with an unresolved discord. Heterodoxy in art is at worst rated as eccentricity or folly; heterodoxy in morals is at once rated as scoundrelism, and, what is worse, propagandist scoundrelism.¹⁹

He was attacked on both counts. Yet he took a comprehensive and businesslike view of the general problem involved:

I know no harder practical question than how much selfishness one ought to stand from a gifted person for the

sake of his gifts or on the chance of his being right in the long run.²⁰

In short, then, Shaw was fully conscious of his strategic position, and had few delusions about it. He had undertaken to revolutionize the British theater; even his reviews were "not a series of judgments aiming at impartiality, but a siege laid to the theatre of the XIXth century by an author who had cut his own way into it at the point of the pen, and thrown some of its defenders into the moat."²¹ He succeeded in his immediate aim — establishing firmly on the London and indeed world stage the "drama which is polemical rather than instinctive in its poignancy."²² And his secondary influence on the course of drama during the last half century has certainly been large, though it is difficult to assess. As Edmund Wilson said (after a devastating account of Shaw's later political utterances), "Of his educative and stimulative influence it is not necessary today to speak. The very methods we use to check him have partly been learned in his school."²³

Misinterpretations of Shaw

One of the most interesting aspects of Shaw criticism lies in the way he has been misunderstood. Not only was he sometimes thought to be joking when he was serious, but vice versa. Moreover, the Shavian reversals of many middle-class values made him downright incomprehensible to many; and as in Ibsen's case, his meaning was sometimes "obscured by its very obviousness."

A rather grotesque misinterpretation, for instance, occurred in the case of the preface to *Major Barbara*, where he declared that "the greatest of our evils, and the worst of our crimes is poverty."²⁴ Shaw was talking in a social context, as his readers should have been aware from the beginning; and he went on with a delicious sketch of the ways in which poverty is a basic crime — not only individually, but socially. Andrew Undershaft, who has been taken as a sign that Shaw was going soft toward the capitalists, understands the responsibility (on the individual level — the dramatic level) which this truth imposes. Critics, unable to escape from the context in which poverty and riches are necessary correlates, take it that Shaw was saying simply that it is better to be rich than poor. In a sense this is true; but Shaw did not mean that it is good to be rich by making other people poor. In fact, the cardinal point in Shaw's indictment of capitalist society was that it rests upon and perpetuates economic and therefore general inequality — as he said over and over.

Thus, when he said "Money is the most important thing in the world," he continued: "It is only when it is cheapened to worthlessness for some and made impossibly dear to others, that it becomes a curse. In short, it is a curse only in such foolish social conditions that life itself is a curse. . . . The first duty of every citizen is to insist on having money on reasonable terms; and this demand is

¹⁷ Christopher Caudwell, *Studies in a Dying Culture*, London, 1938.

¹⁸ *Izvestia*, July 21, 1931, tr. in *Labour Monthly*, XIII, pp. 580-582.

¹⁹ *Sanity of Art*, London, 1908, p. 39.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

²¹ *Dramatic Opinions*, Vol. 1, p. xxi.

²² *Ibid.*, in "G.B.S. on Clement Scott."

²³ *The Triple Thinkers*, London, 1938, p. 196.

²⁴ Penguin edition, Baltimore, 1951, p. vii.

not complied with by giving four men a few shillings each for ten or twelve hours' drudgery and one man a thousand pounds for 'nothing'²⁵ His original "paradoxical" statement turns out, in other words, to be a variation on an ancient and respectable socialist theme — the demand for abolition of inequality in income.

Humor and Propaganda

Now it may have been somewhat coy for Shaw to indulge in such displays of wit; but through them he succeeded in doing two important things: (1) he retained the ear of the middle class long enough to say something into it, and (2) he provoked a certain amount of reflection aimed at "figuring out what he meant," which always tended to backlash into some real thought about the matter, even when the audience was by no means inclined to such thought. Speaking of Ibsen, Shaw said, "All very serious revolutionary propositions begin as huge jokes. Otherwise they would be stamped out by the lynching of their first exponents."²⁶ He projected this observation into a full-scale propagandistic method. With it he achieved a "name for remorseless common sense . . . prevailing on men and artists to regard his gift of lightning logic with an uneasy twilight reverence and awe."²⁷

This technique is seen not only in his plays, where it is too complex to treat here (except for the warnings that Shaw can almost never be said to speak through any individual character, and can rarely be said to write plays with "solutions" — as is particularly clear in *St. Joan*) but also in his superb music criticism, which as he said consisted in the "combination of a laborious criticism with a recklessly flippant manner."²⁸

The Real Joke

There has been no attempt in this article to give a comprehensive overview of Shaw's opinions, except in the area marked off by the title. Even here, it is an exceedingly difficult task to achieve a fair representation of his views and procedures. One of the hardest things for commentators to realize, incidentally, has been that Shaw (for all his buffoonery) was by no means a simpleton. Indeed, perhaps the greatest single obstacle to understanding Shaw's general position has been the reluctance of interpreters to cope with the complexity and immediacy of his views. Shaw was for the most part uncompromisingly hard-headed, and rightly requires more detailed attention than can be given here even in discussing only one aspect of his work. His disdain for what he considered amateurism in public life is sobering:

Yet Wagner, like Marx, was too inexperienced in technical government and administration and too melodramatic in his hero-contra-villain conception of the class struggle, to foresee the actual process by which his generalization would work out, or the part to be played in it by the classes involved.²⁹

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xii.

²⁶ *Quintessence of Ibsenism*, p. 198.

²⁷ Dixon Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

²⁸ "Some Other Critics" in *London Music*, 1889-90, New York, 1937.

²⁹ *The Perfect Wagnerite*, p. 103.

In conclusion, however, perhaps we could take one of Shaw's own comments and apply it as a standard to his work:

The claim of art to our respect must stand or fall with the validity of its pretension to cultivate and refine our senses and faculties. . . Further, art should refine our sense of character and conduct, of justice and sympathy, greatly heightening our self-knowledge, self control, precision of action, and considerateness, and making us intolerant of baseness, cruelty, injustice and intellectual superficiality or vulgarity.

It is customary for bourgeois critics to prophesy that Shaw will be remembered, in the end, for the "pure" artistry of his plays, not for their social functions. The likelihood is, however, almost the opposite — for Shaw was probably the most talented and certainly the most widely known figure in the socialist movement that marked the beginning of the end for British capitalism. The "real joke," it seems, may turn out to be on his audience after all.

ERNEST CALLENBACH

Ernest Callenbach, a student at the University of Chicago, is a member of the *Anvil* editorial board.

Announcing a serious thought publication that is
Dynamic — Progressive — Challenging

World Frontiers

America's Newest Voice of Youth

Articles on world government — civil liberties — discrimination — the Cold War — colonialism — world economic development

"World Frontiers is an attractive and interesting publication and I wish it . . . all success."

Justice William O. Douglas

"I was quite impressed by your publication enterprise. What you are doing is precisely what our student generation badly needs."

Albert Einstein

WORLD FRONTIERS, c/o Manumit School,
RFD No. 2, Bristol, Pa.

I wish to subscribe for 4 issues at \$1.00

Name

Address

Spotlighting the National Campus Scene

New England Students Hold Anti-War School

EARLY THIS SEPTEMBER, in the rolling countryside of eastern Massachusetts, an exciting experiment occurred in student anti-war education. Anti-war students from a dozen different campuses, and as many diverse ideological backgrounds, participated in this unique experiment, — studying, discussing, and living together for a week at a Quaker farm outside of Boston. Forty-five students attended the school, coming from as far west as Pittsburg, Kansas, and Chicago, as well as the New England area. Their backgrounds ranged from radical religious pacifism to militant Marxian socialism, while to many of the younger students these anti-war ideologies were a new intellectual experience.

The motivating force behind the summer school was Focal Point, a student anti-war organization at Yale University, which this year enters its third active year on campus. Focal Point bases its approach on more than pious horror at the ravages of war. We have attempted to examine the social and economic causes of war, to attack the problem at its roots. Anti-Stalinism and anti-imperialism became basic plans in our anti-war program. We found that pacifists, liberals, socialists, and independent radicals all could work together in a politically harmonious fashion within the framework of a broad anti-war coalition. Functioning in truly democratic fashion, welcoming the challenge of diverse views, we have achieved both programmatic and organizational unity.

The summer school was an attempt to do on a larger scale what has already been accomplished on the Yale campus. In undertaking this broader project, we secured the sponsorship and aid of such organizations as the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the War Resisters League, the American Friends Service Committee, the Socialist Youth League, and the Young Socialists. The faculty consisted of A. J. Muste of the FOR, Hal Draper, editor of *Labor Action*, Dr. Eddy Asirvatham, professor at Boston University, and a labor economist formerly active in the European socialist movement. Bill Perry of the Washington chapter of CORE (Congress of Racial Equality) presented the program of that organization.

The curriculum centered around four main areas: war and the economic order, war and the colonial revolution, the nature of Stalinism, and non-violence as a revolutionary strategy. The faculty lectured in these areas, after which the student body broke up into smaller discussion groups. Even more important than these formally structured discussions were the informal bull sessions which ran until the small hours of every morning. Not to go unreported were the hot volleyball and soft ball games, interspersed with

swimming in which the more revolutionary elements engaged in rearranging the locations of the rafts in the lake.

At the end of the week, an evaluation session was conducted by A. J. Muste, who acted as dean of the school. "A.J." observed that the most important job which the school had accomplished was to introduce the revolutionary pacifist and the democratic Marxist socialist to each other. Each had quite frankly come to the school with certain stereotypes about the other. These were definitely challenged and radically revised. While many issues of difference between the two tendencies were not even raised, let alone discussed, nevertheless the summer school was a real pioneering experiment which was just a beginning. The next step is that of cooperating in joint organizational activity on campus, guided by a recognition that on the campus today these two anti-war tendencies are being forced by the logic of the situation to joint activity, if only to stay alive. One of the hoped-for results of the summer school is that this collaboration will be based upon a sounder basis of real understanding and appreciation for each other's position.

Along such lines, the organizational institute held at the end of the school emphasized the use of *Anvil* as the instrumentality specifically designed to provide something around which such collaboration could be built, being by its nature the result of socialist-pacifist cooperation on the national level. The institute also dealt with other specific organizational techniques such as film series, public meetings, study groups, etc., and the various publications which are usable in campus anti-war activity.

Also discussed was the possibility of a regional conference during the school year, and a strong feeling that such a summer school again next year would be most desirable. These last two points seemed to be real concrete evidence that the summer school had done its job of providing the starting point for some kind of fruitful, cooperative anti-war activity by pacifists, socialists, and the fringes of the liberal movement which are still concerned with the drift toward war. The job now remains to make this cooperation a reality on the campuses to which the students at the summer school return this fall.

BILL SHIRLEY

Students for Hoopes

YOUNG SOCIALISTS (previously called the YPSL) have recently laid plans for the formation of independent student committees, for the purpose of mobilizing the protest vote on the campuses behind the Socialist Party ticket. These groups will capitalize on the political interest generated by the presidential elections, to bring a socialist anti-war position before large student audiences. Specifically, the independent student committees will at-

tempt to (1) illustrate the bankruptcy of the major parties in the field of foreign-policy; (2) focus the anti-war sentiment on the campuses in the form of a protest vote; (3) show the connection between the needs of the cold war and the drive toward conformity on the campus; and (4) emphasize the need for a farmer-labor party as an alternative to the two major parties.

Many anti-war students are understandably critical of the past record of the Socialist Party, primarily because of the Party's support of the United Nations in Korea, and its lack of a clearcut opposition to Western imperialism. Nevertheless, there will be considerable sentiment on campus for critical support of the Socialist Party candidates as *protest* candidates. Furthermore, the program of the Independent Students for Hoopes and Friedman will be based on the following sections of the Socialist Party's 1952 platform:

A fourth and basic obstacle to peace is capitalism, which by its nature is centered on profit rather than on human welfare. In its international dealings, capitalism results in exploitation and injustice to the weak in every country. . . In the long view the greatest single contribution the American people can make to peace is to replace an economic system dealing with the world on the basis of selfishness and conflict with a cooperative economy which can build the basic structure of interdependence and mutuality among ourselves and the people of the world.

The threat that Soviet aggression has hurled against the world is tragic. But just as tragic is the inability of the present government to understand its nature and to prepare to meet it with any degree of success. If we are to have permanent peace, there are some basic things which must be understood. The most important of these is that capitalism is a root cause of war, and that capitalism keeps its creaking economy going through preparation for and participation in war. Therefore the very existence of capitalism constantly threatens the world with war.

These are the points that the independent student committees will hammer at: the inability of the present government, or *any* capitalist government to cope with Stalinism and avoid war. A protest movement basing itself on such an approach can have major potentialities on the American campus today.

On the domestic scene, the committees can raise a number of relevant issues that cannot be squarely faced by the liberals campaigning for the major party nominees. Even a liberal member of Students for Democratic Action cannot honestly oppose the anti-radical hysteria if at the same time he supports the very administration that began the whole process of loyalty oaths and subversive lists. Nor can he talk convincingly of the need for an FEPC when his own candidates include a member of the present "majority party of Congress," the DixieGOPs, which has been effectively blocking action on this measure. Both parties have such a miserable record in the field of minority rights and civil liberties that an argument as to which is the lesser evil becomes meaningless. Basic of course is the point that the "liberals" are the staunchest supporters of the permanent war economy. The needs of that economy, rather than the pious wishes of its critical supporters, will determine the rate at which America drifts into the garrison state.

The initial activities of the Students-for-Hoopes com-

mittees will get under way at such campuses as City College, University of Chicago, Antioch College, UCLA, University of Wisconsin, Boston U., and Roosevelt College. The coordination of the national campaign will begin with a series of speaking tours, which will cover most of the large campuses in the East and the Mid West.

The student committees will need help in getting their speakers on the campuses, under the auspices of various campus organizations, or through invitations to debate. The temporary headquarters of the Independent Committee for Hoopes and Friedman is in New York, at 48 Bond St. Pincus Gross of the E.V. Debs Society of CCNY is the coordinating secretary. For more information, or offers of aid, communicate directly with the secretary.

BOGDAN DENITCH

Bogdan Denitch is a member of the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialists, and a member of the *Anvil* editorial board.

L. A. and Kansas Cops All-Out for ANVIL

THE POLICE of various university towns are apparently becoming avid readers of *Anvil*. Two parallel events of the past semester provide instructive examples of police intimidation techniques.

On March 18, a motorcycle cop from the University station of the Los Angeles police department halted sales of *Anvil* in front of the University of Southern California administration building. The officer maintained it was illegal to sell periodicals without a "peddler's permit," and, hinting at possible student violence, also offered the unlikely story of a student having protested against the sales. Hauled off to the station, the *Anvil* salesman, a former USC student, was held for over an hour and a half while the cop, a sergeant, a lieutenant, and a captain searched through the "books" for an ordinance they couldn't find. The *Anvil* salesman asked if he could call the American Civil Liberties Union, but was not allowed to make this or any other call. He was held without charge while the police scanned *Anvil* for "subversive lines." One cop insinuated that *Anvil* was the same magazine they had taken away from "some Red a while ago on the streets," but a series of calls to headquarters and perhaps to L.A.'s notorious Red Squad, seemed to prove disappointing. However, the mention of socialism and socialist clubs in the magazine convinced them they had stumbled on "something hot."

"What I can't understand," said the motorcycle cop, "is why anyone would waste time selling such things unless he got something out of it." They wanted to know who sponsored the magazine. They found the organizations listed inside. They wished to know the local outlet in L.A. for *Anvil*. "Where is your office?" The fact that there was no office, just a few students and anti-war peo-

ple who received bundle orders on consignment, only increased their suspicions. "What is your attitude toward Russia? . . . Are you against the social order in America? . . . What is your aim?", they asked.

Reading *Anvil* Like Taking Dope

"No phone calls until the lieutenant returns," said the sergeant. The lieutenant didn't return. The sergeant then had a conference with the captain. Finally, "The captain wants to see you," he said. In the captain's office there followed another hour of waiting. Finally, the motorcycle cop came back and whispered something to the captain. They both smiled pleasantly. "There is no ordinance against selling that literature," said the captain. "We're sorry we kept you waiting so long. We just got our call through. You're free to go. But first, would you mind rolling up your sleeves?" They examined the young man's arms. "What do you think of those eyes?", asked the captain. "I was struck a while ago by the fact that his eyes dilate, just like marijuana users. But he assures me he never used the stuff. And he claims he hasn't been drinking today or last night. Very strange."

"Show him out," said the captain. "Don't stop selling that literature on our account. But we're thinking of your own good. Many students here hate radicals, and they might beat you up." "Why only a while back," said the cop confidentially, "I had to stop a riot against a guy with literature." "You know how it is," said the captain. "We have to watch out for Reds around these colleges. Some of the students might think you're selling subversive literature. We're thinking of your own good."

The other arrest occurred at Lawrence, Kansas, where the University of Kansas (KU) is located. On May 14, a young man and a girl, students at KU and members of its Socialist Study Club, were picked up while selling the spring issue of *Anvil*. The two policemen who carried out the arrest, when questioned as to the right of arrest without charges, mumbled something about a peddler's license, then said, "Right or no right, you are going to come along." Inside the station, the police refused to explain the charges on which the two students were being held, and in return met a refusal to answer any questions at all. The *Anvil* salesmen were then searched, relieved of the contents of their pockets, and placed in separate but adjoining cells. Approximately half an hour later they were released for questioning. During the questioning they were kept in separate rooms and were unable to communicate.

Although the students were dealt with separately, the pattern was similar in each case. First came an indecisive interview with the Chief of Police. Here the students tried to accomplish two objectives: (1) to establish the status of the "case" at this point. The Chief of Police declared that there were no charges as yet, and that "as far as I'm concerned you've done nothing wrong," but nevertheless he held them for questioning by the assistant county attorney (2) To secure legal counsel. The Chief of Police stated that the decision on legal counsel was his and the county attorney's until the event of charges being pressed,

when it would become a matter of law. Legal counsel was repeatedly asked for, and refused in every instance.

"Questions of Common Knowledge"

Both students refused at first to answer questions in the absence of the other, but this position had to be abandoned, under threat by the assistant county attorney that he would press charges, unless they cooperated by answering "questions of common knowledge," such as name, address, student identification, etc. In each case, however, these questions were expanded to include such matters as the students' connections with the Socialist Study Club, whether they were making money by selling *Anvil*, whether they were now, or had ever been, members of the CP, and if they believed in overthrowing the government by force and violence. Following this political inquisition, both students were forced to submit to "printing and mugging," as a condition of prompt release, — again backed by the threat of pressing charges if they refused.

Two "political" discussions which occurred during the course of the interrogation are worth reproducing as an index to the police mentality. At one point the girl defended her refusal to answer questions before she knew the nature of the charges against her, as a matter of principle. The assistant county attorney thereupon launched into a heated and sarcastic tirade against principles, stating that people who insisted on sticking by their principles always ended up in the gutter, lived wretched lives, and in general came to no good end. The student suggested that it was precisely the people who refused to stand by their principles who were responsible for the rise of fascism. The attorney answered that she was young, and would learn in time that there were principles not worth sticking by!

In his interview with the other student, the assistant county attorney made a little patriotic speech, which consisted of praising American democracy and commenting on the ineffectiveness of minority groups. The student pointed out that to carry out socialist ideas, and to maintain the possibility of spreading them, was the best way to preserve and extend American democracy.

Trying to prove the ineffectuality of minority groups, the attorney pointed out to the editorial, "The Feinberg Law — a Bitter Defeat," and asked: "Now this article here was probably written by a Jew, wasn't it?", to which the student replied sharply that he didn't see what this had to do with the matter. The assistant county attorney hastily asserted that he didn't mean to imply "that there was anything wrong with Jews," but explained that "they were an embittered minority, due to the persecutions, and tended to have a distorted view of things." In any case, he went on, it didn't pay to associate oneself with embittered minority groups. He again brought up the smallness of the Socialist Study Club and expressed disbelief that it could accomplish anything. The student then asked, "If we are so small and ineffectual, why are you so worried about us?" The assistant county attorney gave no coherent reply for a few seconds, then curtly stated "I am not worried about you."

An interesting facet of the incident is to note that intimidation was not restricted to the local police alone. The university administration was called and informed of the students' political activities. It happened in this case that the administration took a "friendly" view of the matter, confirmed the status of the Socialist Study Club as a legitimate student organization, and apparently advised the police to release the prisoners without pressing charges. Under different circumstances, however, the false arrests might have resulted in the students getting in hot water with school authorities.

At one point in the proceedings, the ubiquitous FBI was also called in. During the questioning of the girl, an FBI agent entered the room briefly. He later left, saying he had no interest in the case: "You weren't selling any Communist literature, were you?" — "No" — "You don't advocate overthrow of the government by force and violence, do you?" — "No" — "Okay."

There are definite lessons to be drawn from these experiences. To begin with, in both cases the police had no basis whatsoever for the arrests. Ordinances against peddlers, even where they exist, don't apply to the sale of periodicals in the streets — as long as the sales don't involve "obstruction of traffic," or the violation of some other ordinance. In the Lawrence case, the Socialist Study Club availed itself of legal advice and determined that this was a case of false arrest and false imprisonment, and that the police officers involved could be sued. The club contented itself however with a public apology. It is unlikely that in a similar situation the case of the police would be stronger. There are Supreme Court rulings to the effect that it is unconstitutional to inhibit the sales of any political or religious publication on a public street. All local ordinances to the contrary are invalid and will not stand up under test.

In both cases the conduct of the police was based on intimidation techniques and bluffing. In Lawrence the two students involved called the bluff and achieved something in the nature of a success. In retrospect the SSC decided, however, that their conduct should have been more uncompromising, since there was no basis whatsoever for the arrest, since compromise of any kind implies recognition of the validity of the police's arbitrary conduct, and since

complete non-cooperation would have further strengthened their position.

Future Course to Follow

It was decided that the course to be followed in the future should run more or less along these lines: refusal to answer any questions as long as charges are not made clear, and as long as no explanations for the arrest are given; when charges are made, refuse to answer any questions until contact with legal counsel is established; if no charges exist, demand to be released immediately and refuse to answer any questions while formally under arrest. It is true that in most places the police can hold anyone for 24 hours *on suspicion*, but if no ordinance exists which could apply to the case, there cannot be suspicion on these grounds, and the case is one of false arrest. As far as the FBI is concerned, nobody is under a legal obligation to answer any questions at all to its representatives, unless the latter hold a warrant for arrest.

These incidents also point up the great importance of the organization involved keeping track of its sellers, and being ready to mobilize liberal support and secure legal aid in case of emergency. In the case of the Lawrence arrests, the effects of the intransigent stand of its members were definitely positive for the SSC. Energetic faculty support made itself felt soon after the arrest, and later, liberal opinion was rallied in support of the club. The club's position in the university was considerably strengthened, and the assurance was gained from city and university authorities that no such thing would be allowed to happen again to anyone.

From this experience the KU students concluded that determined opposition is the best method to defend themselves against arbitrary intimidation. It is essential, of course, that in all cases ordinances be carefully checked with the city clerk. Once the legal basis is clear, however, any attempt at intimidation should be firmly opposed. In tense situations, the ACLU or a lawyer should be informed beforehand, and perhaps be asked to remind the police department that they, as well as the average citizen, can be subjected to public pressures, and can be held legally responsible for their actions.

GERALD CARR and ALAN DANIELS

BOOKS IN REVIEW

WILLIAM FAULKNER

by Irving Howe

Random House, 1952.

RANDOM HOUSE has recently published an excellent critical study of William Faulkner by Irving Howe. Mr. Howe has submitted a major critical estimate of Faulkner's novels which is superior in conception to any work currently available.

William Faulkner is a much maligned and misunderstood American writer. Earlier appraisals of his books leave one in doubt as to whether the critics troubled to read his novels. They have dubbed him a Southern regionalist, a wilful obscurantist, and, not infrequently, a charlatan. His style of writing has provoked a score of satirical imitations in the *New Yorker* and other semi-literate periodicals. Some "leftist" critics are fond of revealing their sociological

acumen by labelling Faulkner a spokesman for Southern fascism.

Mr. Howe's study is distinguished by an ability to point out the changes in Faulkner's outlook on a number of themes basic to his novels. Most of Faulkner's writing has been concerned with the Negro, the Civil War and its aftermath, and the corruption of what he thinks of as the Southern traditions. Howe states that while Faulkner's initial exploration of these traditions led him to an acceptance and perpetuation of them, his later works reflect a testing and subsequent rejection:

The myth appears in its simplest form

in the *Unvanquished*, — a few of the stories in that book are hardly distinguishable from the romancing of popular Southern fiction. By *Intruder in the Dust* Faulkner has almost broken away from the Southern myth.

It is this development which provides much of the tension in Faulkner's prose and leaves so many of his characters in a dramatic suspension.

Howe undertakes a very satisfactory examination of Faulkner's treatment of the Negro, in which he illustrates a substantial movement from the presentation of the Negro as a clown or victim to the point of writing of the Negro as a credible human being. It is fruitless to look for a neat definition of Faulkner's attitude toward the Negro, for it is a welter of contradictions, composed both of warm tribute for his ability to endure, and a hysterical fear of miscegenation. The Negro has customarily been a passive observer in Faulkner's works. Even Lucas, at his more active moments, is little more than a reluctant motivator. It is encouraging, incidentally, to find one critic who does not consider Joe Christmas a villain.

This study serves both as an introduction and a stimulus to the reading of Faulkner. For Faulkner presents a number of problems to the casual reader who enters Yoknapatawpha County at the suggestion of a friend, or by selecting one of Faulkner's novels by chance. If *Sanctuary* happens to be his first glimpse of Faulkner, he is hardly likely to pursue him further. Other works currently available in the pocket book editions are equally discouraging, not because of their thematic weakness, but because of their difficult prose, which seems to bear out Faulkner's jest that he never fully realizes that others will read what he has written. Howe's book is valuable in that it concentrates on a clear exposition of the themes of Faulkner's novels, where more emphasis has been laid on a foot-note exegesis of the symbolic content of his books. Howe contributes notably to a lucid reading of Faulkner's in his discussion of the sections of *The Sound and the Fury* which have previously baffled and frustrated many Faulkner readers.

Stylistic Range

There are important stylistic differences among Faulkner's novels. No other living author has been so willing to experiment with such a variety of literary forms. The range is from the flat bitterness of *Soldier's Pay*, to the incredible complexity of Benjy's reflections, which are presented in a sustained stream of consciousness, — to brilliant culmination in the dramatic structure of his most recent work, *Requiem for a Nun*.

Perhaps the most neglected element in Faulknerian criticism has been the recognition of his genuinely comic ability. This is not to say that he will ever replace Joe Miller, for much of his humor has an underlying savageness, as in Jason's raging against the Western Union Telegraph Service, which he blames for his losses in stock speculation. There is a long section in *The Hamlet* that tells of the efforts of a Texas horse trader to dispose of his stock to a group of unwilling buyers. The Texan himself bears a facial scar as a result of a recent encounter with the horses who are extremely wild and aggressive. The following is a part of the dialogue:

"Who says that pony ain't worth fifteen dollars? You couldn't buy that much dynamite for just fifteen dollars. There ain't one of them that can't do a mile in three minutes; turn them into pasture and they will board themselves; work them like hell all day, and every time you think about it, lay them over the head with a singletree, and after a couple of days every jack rabbit of them will be so tame you will have to put them out of the house at night like a cat."

"Come on Eck," he said. "Start her off. How about ten dollars for that horse, Eck?"

"What need I got for a horse I would need a bear-trap to catch?", Eck said.

"Didn't you just see me catch him?"

"I seen you," Eck said. "And I dont want nothing as big as a horse if I got to wrastle with it every time i finds me on the same side of the fence it's on."

Faulkner's Isolation

Howe was more successful in relating the personal life of Anderson to his literary output, but Faulkner eludes him, and it is no wonder. For this is the man whom *Life* magazine quotes as saying (when his picture was taken in connection with the publicity for the movie of *Intruder*) 'It's like bullets, after the first one the shock isn't so great.' William Faulkner is a magnificently aloof person who delights in confounding others by living the kind of life that suits him best. One of the acknowledged literary greats, he is not easily available for discussions of his works; he seldom leaves Jefferson, correction, Oxford, and is like as not apt to come forth with the most ill-informed statement about our immigration policies, or about the number of persons benefitting from the social security laws, — a person who on occasion can sound more like Jason than Jason himself.

Faulkner is a complex contradictory, and creative man, whose books merit wide reading, with no better introduction than Mr. Howe's recent work.

FRED SAMUELS

INVISIBLE MAN

by Ralph Ellison

"Who knows but that, on the lower frequencies, I speak for you?"

WERE RALPH ELLISON'S

Invisible Man but another "race novel," as the middleclass Negro absorbed in the general American middle-class culture is apt to view all novels dealing with Negro life, its interest would be somewhat circumscribed. Rarely has the novelist of Negro life been able to rise from the particular to the universal; rarely has he been able to write a novel of symbolic force whose meaning radiates beyond the topical matter which is its crude substance. Novels of such scope generally are most common. *Invisible Man* is a work of this magnitude, and is perhaps the most ambitious novel of Negro life in America which has yet appeared.

Theme of the Novel

Alienated man as Negro is the theme and substance of Ralph Ellison's semi-autobiographical novel. A well-mannered, readily compliant, cautiously respectful young high-school valedictorian, whose graduation day oration propounds humility as the essence of progress, goes off to a model Negro college, one of those islands of an aspiring Negro middle-class patronized by Northern white philanthropists, and dedicated to "Negro betterment." Enthralled with the vision of "The Founder," — the hope of freedom within segregation, — life at college, its genial atmosphere, its sophistication, its optimism subsumes the hero's consciousness, and makes him wish to emulate the successful, powerful college head.

Expelled from college for accidentally chauffeuring a wealthy Northern white patron beyond the "redeemed" environs of the college, and for leading him to the real South of poverty and degradation, the young hero is hurled Northwards, into the tantalizing freedom of Harlem. Here he comes to join the Brotherhood, a Stalinist organization, not out of a developed social consciousness, but rather impelled by the same success drive bred on the campus in the shadow of the mythic Founder's statue. Not necessarily a success drive in the narrow sense of personal aggrandizement, devoid of idealism and scruples; but success drive as a value, based on the illusion of limitless potential for individual achievement:

Here was a way that didn't lead through the back door, a way not limited by black and white, but a way which, if one lived long enough and worked hard enough, could lead to the highest possible rewards.

The hero becomes wholly enrapt in the Brotherhood, identifies himself with its aims, is enriched with its dignity-conferring powers, rises to the local prominence for which he has been groomed and then, the slow, painful disenchantment, the wavering over the abyss, and final plunge into . . . invisibility.

Brotherhood to the hero had meant an opportunity to "define" himself. Outside of Brotherhood meant outside of time, of history. The crushing experience of a party-line shift, abandoning the Negro struggle for "national issues," the realization of his own and his people's expendability, of their having been used, shatter the hero's attempt at any meaningful integration into society.

Nature of Invisibility

Invisibility comes as the awareness of never having been seen. The autocratic Negro college head who sacrificed him in the interest of "policy," the Northern white philanthropist who holds Negro progress his peculiar "destiny," the grotesque one-eyed Brotherhood commissar who consults History like a prophet, but never the hero's own thoughts and feelings — none of these men have ever seen him, all of them have used him.

The experience of donning dark glasses in order to pass unrecognized by hostile black nationalists, and being mistaken for a nihilistic character who combines the professions of pimp, numbers racketeer, extortionist and fake spiritual healer, forces a further awareness of the nature of invisibility. Mistaken for Rinehart, he is almost forced to fight a friend — the role coerces him despite his own inclinations. The subsequent flight into himself is an uncritical rejection of role-playing. He must find himself, by himself, first if not last for himself.

Ellison's impressionistic style of writing, perhaps overlaid with surrealist effects, creates a tone which supports the hero's discovery of his non-identity. The hero's attempt to understand the relationship between experience and identity forces a spiritual crisis posed as choice between the nihilistic exploitation of chaos as defined in "Rinehartism," and the plunge outside of society into "invisibility." Negative as the hero's choice of the latter first appears, it emerges as an affirmation of self stronger than any heard in recent American fiction. Had the resolution been less complex, it would have sounded almost strident, clashing with the simple yet powerful truth that "Life is to be lived, not controlled."

Ellison's hero rejects the soul-sickness of modern Negro life — the inevitable internalization of the dominant cultural values — and asks, "Must I strive toward colorlessness?" His slave grand-

father "never had any doubt about his humanity — that was left to his 'free' offspring." The plight of the Negro people is, seen as inextricably interwoven with the fate of all Americans. Braced by a perhaps too defensive irony, the hero finds the "cream of the joke" in the question: "Weren't we part of them as well as apart from them and subject to die when they died?"

Affirmation of Self

Invisibility or self-entrenchment leads to self-affirmation, to awareness of individuality, but the hero, confronted with the social and political facts of increasing conformity and regimentation, senses the anachronism of his discovery. He is a century too late, and isn't at all certain that he's in the avant-garde of history. The rank individualist, however, loses patience with the "laws of history," with the impersonal business of politics. Ellison's hero, rejecting both capitalism (Bledsoe the college head, and Norton the philanthropist, and Sta-

linism, Jack the Brotherhood commissar) is faced with a void which he can only begin to fill through his own reality and worth as an individual.

As a record of a spiritual progress, the novel has a disarmingly candid effect — the kind of impact peculiar to only the most honest writing. Ellison's hero sheds many illusions and achieves a significant victory in his struggle to define himself. But he can only intimate emergence from the underground. He is certain that he can't remain "invisible" forever, but the problem of integration into society remains unsolved. And how could it be otherwise, since alienated man as Negro is but the radical type of our common fate. The articulate today are all semi-denizens of the underground, and that man's a fool that doesn't know the hole he's in.

LEONARD PRAGER

Leonard Prager is Chairman of Focal Point at Yale University, where he is a graduate student.

Contemporary Issues

— A Magazine for a Democracy of Content

Contents No. 11

Persian Oil: America Defeats Britain

Andrew Maxwell

America's Garrison Economy

Nathan Davidson

The Society for Social Responsibility
in Science: A Follow Up

PM

Crime and Competition in America

Thomas Cranmer

Contents No. 12

The Problem of Chemicals in Food

L. Herber

The Crisis of Europe

Joseph Ramai

Quarterly, at \$1.60 per year

Write

CONTEMPORARY PRESS

545 Fifth Avenue

New York City 17, N. Y.

PROGRAM of the NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR

The primary aim of the New York Student Federation Against War is to organize all students opposed to the war drives of Russian and American imperialism which threaten the very existence of world civilization. We aim to prevent the polarization of the American student body into either of these reactionary war camps.

We are irreconcilably opposed to the totalitarian tyranny which rules over such countries as Russia, her Eastern European vassal states and fascist Spain. We advocate the overthrow of these regimes by democratic forces from within these countries and enthusiastically endorse all such forces. At the same time we do not accept the rationalization and apology for the war drives of American imperialism on the basis of militarily stopping Stalinism.

In the United States, today, all of our democratic rights are seriously menaced. Above all, local and national government and big business have reached a political affinity in their attempts to stifle labor and radical organizations, and to virtually outlaw the Stalinist movement. This political reaction has its parallel in the academic world where one university administration after another has initiated campus witch hunts.

Racial and religious discrimination and persecution remains the shame of the nation. Jim Crow, in particular, remains largely unabated. The murder of Negroes in the South, their discrimination in Northern industry, the segregation policy in academic institutions have, by now, become characteristic of the social psychology of America's industrial and political leaders. It is the aim of the New York Student Federation Against War to conduct militant struggles for the complete social, political and economic equality of the Negro people.

The growing political reaction at home finds its counterpart in America's foreign policy: bolstering reactionary regimes in Spain, Greece and Turkey; the North Atlantic Pact and the subsidization of the military machines of Western Europe and support of German rearmament.

The New York Student Federation Against War

does not believe that war is inevitable. We are convinced that the drive toward war can be eliminated by building democratic political and social structures in place of America's growing garrison state and Russia's rapacious imperialism. It is to this end that we are dedicated.

As a student organization in the United States we have the following special and immediate role to play in building a just and democratic world:

1. Education: *As students we will make every effort to stimulate political and social thought on campus; to attempt to instill among the student body a sense of responsibility and self-confidence; to encourage discussion and debate of political issues and local campus political problems.*

2. Organization: *To present the particular views of the New York Student Federation Against War we urge all sympathetic students to make every effort to organize recognized college clubs; and, similarly, we urge all existing clubs sympathetic to the views of the Federation, and not already affiliated to it, to take immediate steps to join the Federation.*

3. Activities: *In addition to general political education the Federation proposes to its constituent clubs that they participate actively in daily campus political activity; to enter all struggles for the defense of student rights, to guarantee the right to organize on campus and to hear speakers of a club's own choosing; to fight against faculty or administrative supervision of student activities; to fight for an end to racial and religious discrimination on campus and in fraternities.*

4. Federation Activities: *In addition to local campus activities the Federation proposes intercollegiate campaigns to fight for democracy and peace through meetings, petition campaigns, education, etc. The Federation will conduct city wide actions in behalf of the fight to end Jim-Crow and to turn back the increasing assault on civil and academic liberties. The Federation will also seek out other student groups in an effort to conduct joint campaigns on such issues.*

BUSINESS OFFICE NOTICE

Individual students or clubs which wish to order bundles of ANVIL AND STUDENT PARTISAN to sell on campus should write the magazine's business manager for rates and conditions. All correspondence concerning business should be sent to the following address:

ANVIL AND THE STUDENT PARTISAN
NEW YORK 1, N. Y. **41 WEST 33rd STREET**

SUBSCRIPTION

Enclosed find \$1.00 for a 5 issue subscription to ANVIL AND STUDENT PARTISAN.

Name

Address

School